Intern sensor 1

Montecarlo Simulation:

Procedure:

Clear implementation of the steps in the paper (3)

Comment:

It is an interesting implementation, but it lacks better documentation. It is not easy to map one-to-one with the procedure in the article without good documentation of the loops and the steps.

It seems to have a but in line 140:

In argument: `Evaluation_level == classes$Evaluation_level[n]`.
Caused by error:
! `..1` must be of size 48 or 1, not size 0.

The conde must run smoothly. It is for supporting the results not for the user to debug it.

Clear use of the data in table 3 (2)

Comment:

It is interpreted properly

Clear procedure to handle the selection of the samples (2)

Comment:

There is a proper implementation of the evaluation of the samples with the statistics.

Number of simulations following the 1:12 (0)

Comment:

It does not show up clearly in the implementation. And it is not documented.

Discussion of the results (4)

Comment:

The discussion is good

NHH case

Is the study relevant to NHH (3)

Comment:

The discussion is not properly and consistently tied with the research question explicitly stated in the paper.

It discusses generally the characteristics of NHH but it lacks precision.

It is possible to use some questions from NHH survey (1)

Comment:

The report points to the NHH survey being more general. This is a misinterpretation of the paper since they also have a general survey but explicitly state they choose to focus on the numerical question. NHH's survey has those too. That is indeed one of the limitations.

What are the challenges (3)

Comment:

It is discussed.

Is the simulation design appropriate? (1)

Comment:

It is generally discussed but not precisely tied to the characteristics of the procedure.

Are there any issues with bias? (1)

Comment:

It is barely mentioned.

Queueing

Steady-state probabilities (4)

Comment:

Well done.

Average measures (1)

Comment:

The expected value for L has a mistake.

The effective lambda must be calculated also using the steady-state probabilities.

Little's law is properly used.

Stability (4)

Comment:

The finiteness of the system is recognized.

Simulation (3)

Comment:

The simulation is correct. The differences are due to the mistakes in the analytical part. This should have tipped you off that something was not right somewhere because done properly both must match quite closely.

Normal services (1)

Comment:

Where is the support for your conclusions? There is not numerical test using the simulation you have to backup your answer. It is purely speculative. Times could be normal, you need to take the proper precautions.

Vaccination clinic

Reproduce the model

Flow chart implementation (5)

Comment:

Well done.

Routing probabilities (5)

Comment:

Well done.

Walking speeds handling (0)

Comment:

This is not considered in the model. This would also be important for space and capacity considerations. Any reason to disagree should be explicit.

The time distributions (4)

Comment:

What is the justification for an alpha of 4 in the interarrival times? That sounds arbitrary. Now, what is the constant arrival scheme? Does that mean deterministic?

Means of the times (5)

Comment:

Well done.

Model runs (5)

Comment:

It runs and is reasonably representative.

Application:

Capacity assessment (4)

Comment:

Well done

Personnel requirements (4)

Comment:

Well done

The scale of Bergen (4)

Comment:

Well done

Recommendations (4)

Comment:

Well done

How was the simulation used for the recommendations (3)

Comment:

Is 10 replication enough? That sounds low if one wants to collect meaningful statistics.

Ingen bemerkninger