

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_97523
Title of the Manuscript:	OBLIQUE TRANSFERENCE TECHNIQUE FOR MULTI RETAILER SUPPLY CHAIN SYSTEM INVENTORY CONTROL
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	Base on results 'no', but for comparison approach 'yes' The title is good No.. The abstract is not representative of the content , method and contributions of the paper structure of the manuscript need to improve more.. the manuscript need to improve regarding to validation of model and data. Please review some formula in the manuscript. Need to ad some method and the result can be improve by optimization approach. The references lack of sufficient and recent, please add minimum 20 (the last 5 years) journals in your manuscript as baseline to review, reference and benchmark for your research.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is not clear, the manuscript needs improve language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker.	
Optional/General comments	Do the best.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Faishal
Department, University & Country	Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia