

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_120657
Title of the Manuscript:	A Production Inventory Model for Fractionally Time-Dependent Demand Rate with Weibull Deterioration and Partially Backlogged Items
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A comprehensive model and specific solution method have not been introduced. Work restrictions have not been seen. Validity of the model and assumptions have not been measured. It is not a scientific method to validate the model only by using a numerical example. The summary table also does not show well the gap between studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think a title without "model" or Specify the model type is better.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, The abstract contains all the details of the work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Work restrictions have not been seen. Validity of the model and assumptions have not been measured. It is not a scientific method to validate the model only by using a numerical example.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes, but the summary table and references set does not show well the gap between studies.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality specially in abstract should be improved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roya M. Ahari
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran