

**Review Form 1.7**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_ARJOM_96676</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>A Mathematical Model of Optimal Manufacturer-Retailer Trade Credit Policy with End-User Credit Support</b> |
| 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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br/><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>The manuscript is important and actual in recent development for scientific community</p> <p>The title is suitable<br/>The abstract describes the word of authors in detail<br/>There is a rich literature used in this article<br/>The structure of the paper is well organised</p> <p>I suggest The manuscript should not be considered an original article but a review article</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>  |   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Shpetim Rexhepi</b>                           |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Mother Teresa University, North Macedonia</b> |