

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_126473
Title of the Manuscript:	Solving a Relaxed Min-Cost Redundancy Allocation Model with a Lagrange Multiplier and Newton’s Method
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	(1) this research work added to the body of knowledge in the area of improving the reliability of products using mathematical models (2) it assist the design engineer to improve engineering products in terms of cost, weight and volume. (3) it provide optimal values for solving redundancy allocation problem.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable with little adjustment; Solving a Relaxed Min-Cost Redundancy Allocation Model using Lagrange Multiplier and Newton's Method	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract lack some information about the article: (1) discussion of methodology (2) research results. These points should be included in the abstract. The keywords are too many, please reduce to about five.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	(1) The problem statement was not properly defined. (2) the structure of section one, that is, the introduction was not properly arrange, it supposed to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Study backgroundProblem statementReview of related works (3) please check section 2 and 3 as well in terms of structure. (4) the result obtain are not clear please throw more light on it.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	(1) the article is design to address recent challenges, in terms of cost, weight and volume. (2) it is using recent technique to address the problem.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	(1) the references are sufficient and recent as well (2) please check numbering of the references	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The article is good but need revision.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aligbe Alex
Department, University & Country	Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), Kaduna, Nigeria