

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3863
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparison of Methods for Internet Traffic Sharing in Computer Network
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides an important extension of Naldi's work on Markov chain models in internet traffic sharing. By comparing call-by-call and two-call basis models, it offers a deeper understanding of user behavior in competitive ISP markets. The findings on traffic distribution and blocking probabilities could be valuable for ISPs aiming to improve Quality of Service (QoS) and reduce network congestion.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the chapter. No changes are necessary.	
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 is comprehensive and summarizes the manuscript well. However, I suggest explicitly mentioning the significance of the two-call basis findings for traffic management strategies.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically robust. The mathematical derivations and Markov chain applications appear accurate and well-supported by references.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, but some are slightly outdated. I recommend including more recent studies from 2015 onward to reflect current advancements in traffic management and stochastic modeling.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear but could benefit from minor grammatical corrections and improved sentence flow in sections like the introduction and conclusion.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The visual representation of results is helpful. However, figures could be better labeled and formatted for clarity, especially Fig. 5 to Fig. 9. Adding a section discussing practical implications for ISPs would enhance the manuscript's value. The manuscript is scientifically sound and has potential significance in the field. However, minor improvements in references, language, and figure formatting are necessary.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iman Farhadian Dehkordi
Department, University & Country	Allameh Naini Higher Education Institute, Iran