

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_108771
Title of the Manuscript:	STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING DEMURRAGE AT THE DOUALA CONTAINER TERMINALS (RTC TERMINAL) DURING IMPORTATION
Type of the Article	

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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, I think this manuscript is scientifically important and also very interesting. However, I would like to point out the following comments:</p> <p>1.1 Reduced free time and increased fees for demurrage and detention have created a lot organizational challenges within the maritime supply chain. Increasingly actors have fallen back on transportation by truck to and from the hinterland to reduce costs. This is particular true among the EU member countries. The following research paper has shown that this approach has a lot of advantages including: digitalization, extra 'free time' for hinterland locations, and more attention during the negotiation process.</p> <p>1.2 "Demurrage and detention: from operational challenges towards solutions" by Katrien Storms et al, in <i>Journal of Shipping and Trade</i>, 8(3), 2023.</p> <p>2. The title is fine.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, to the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and up to date.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eric Li
Department, University & Country	The University of Hong Kong, China