Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Mathematics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJOM_94969**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPUTER PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE SOLUTION TO A TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM INVOLVING A CONCAVE COST FUNCTION**
Type of the Article	**Computer-Programming implementation of mathematical solution to optimization problem.**

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)

Review Form 1.7

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)**	**Yes. It is the beginning of showing how to use established optimization methods in a practical way. Much work is needed though to show how the solution relates to the specific problem at hand.** **Yes. However, the paper leans too heavily on computer programming and not enough on the mathematics, equation parameters, and solution process involved. These have nothing to do with computers or their programming.** **No. Problem to be solved is not explained. Acronyms are used without being spelled out. The equation given is not explained, nor is the "optimal value".** **No. Author needs to relate parameters of the problem to be solved to the parameters of the equation and the optimal solution.** **No. Hard to tell for readers outside the author's immediate peer group.** **No. Need references to the optimization methods used.** **Please see my detailed comments within the attached commented manuscript.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Yes. Please see my detailed comments within the attached commented manuscript. There are a few nit-noids to consider.**	
Optional/General comments	**This paper has the potential of being very instructive. What it needs is a clear exposition of the problem to be solved. Then an explanation of the optimization method. Then a relationship needs to be shown between the parameters to mathematical parameters and how they evolve to get the optimal result. The programming then becomes an implementation example that could be applied with new problem parameters. Please see my detailed comments within the attached commented manuscript.**	

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:	**Peter G. Raeth**
Department, University & Country	**Nova Southeastern University, USA**