



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_53491</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Discrete-Event Simulation of Clients Flow in Ante-Natal Clinic</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 9-19: Validate your result comparing the result of the simulation and current result before modification</li> <li>2. Data from the survey should be provided indicating arrival, waiting and departure time for at least one year, which will be used to validate your simulation result.</li> <li>3. Line 25, 29, 34, 42,63, 102 and 129 non of the reference in the passage was listed in reference lists.</li> <li>4. Line 73 to 83 should not appear as methodology, you are just defining the terms.</li> <li>5. Line 311 to 329: Very limited reference and not properly presented. Add more reference</li> <li>6. There should be design of experiment with your experimental factors- Possible combination of doctors, nurses and administration to give an optimal reduction in waiting time considering the cost of hiring doctors and nurses. That is the minimum number of nurses and doctors that will give optimal results.</li> <li>7. Line 143: How do you arrive at the equation?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 254 to 256 and Line 258 to 260 are saying the same thing, please expunge one.</li> <li>2. Line 309 to 310: Did you carry out survey to study the satisfaction level of expectant mothers before drawing the conclusion that they are not happy?</li> <li>3. Line 52, 60 and other lines: Change expecting mothers to expectant mothers</li> <li>4. Line 62 and other: You use "We" a personal pronoun, it is not accepted in research work</li> <li>5. Line 300 to 302: How do you know that discrete-event simulation is better than others in modelling antenatal? Have you tried other models?</li> <li>6. Gramtical error should be checked.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The research ariticle need to be worked upon thoroughly by the author.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chinedu James Ujam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Nigeria</b>