

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_84627
Title of the Manuscript:	Time Delay in Engagement Schedules in a Public University in Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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	<b>1.The author should have mentioned about the schedule of meeting in the paper. The frequency of meeting scheduled has to be considered, so that the delay can be better studied. This part is missing.</b>	It has now been clarified that, the Colleges have equal meeting frequencies. Hence, this will not have effect on the study of delay since the colleges have the same frequencies of meeting. (See as highlighted at page 6)
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The author has considered multiple colleges to study the delay was good.</li><li>2. Relating the parameter to the markov process was good.</li><li>3. Consider the frequency of meeting for each college and try to analyse the delay samples for each college, so that the delay can be better studied based on the probability.</li></ol>	Further Analysis on the delays for the various colleges can be seen in tables 1, 2 and figure 2 and 3. As already indicated, all the colleges have equal meeting frequencies. (See as highlighted in pages 6 to 8)
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper can be accepted with minor revisions and it is a study paper only, not a research article.	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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>	