

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_96676
Title of the Manuscript:	A Mathematical Model of Optimal Manufacturer-Retailer Trade Credit Policy with End-User Credit Support
Type of the 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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive but with little observation in the keywords: (a) In the keywords, only the first letter is expected to be in capital letter, e.g. <i>Trade credit and NOT Trade Credit</i> etc (b) Line number 6 has no any purpose. (if so remove)</p> <p>4. The sections/subsections are fairly appropriate. However lines 15 and 23 should be the beginning of new paragraphs respectively.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically ok</p> <p>6. The references are enough and close to 65% are recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Fig 5 is not mentioned in the manuscripts (Author should refer to it in the manuscript)</p> <p>Author should correct the spelling: Formulation and NOT Fomulation in line 63</p> <p>Check alignment between lines 14 to 22</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author needs to revisit the paper for necessary corrections as observed.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bello Hassan Kehinde
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria