



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_46546
Title of the Manuscript:	Supply Chain Optimization for Farmer-Bepari system of Agricultural Products in Bangladesh.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

**PART 2:**

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Below were the issues I raised in the second evaluation. None of them was addressed, instead the author(s) said they have tried their best. The authors never bother to check the difference between APA and CSE methods of documenting research work.</p> <p><b>Final Comment: The paper should be rejected for lacking in research ethics. If the publisher goes ahead to publish the work, I will advise my name should be removed as one of the reviewers to protect my name.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Abstract is still poorly written. This means the abstract is not well-organized.</li> <li>2. No major corrections were effected,</li> <li>3. The author(s) used different styles of documentation- APA and Council of Science Editor (CSE) methods of citations/referencing. Authors should endeavour to study these methods carefully and apply them where suitable.</li> <li>4. Presentation is poor, communication and wrong use of English language.</li> <li>5. Citation/references are too old. The currency of a paper is very important in academic writing.</li> </ol> <p><b>Final Comment:</b> Authors should send the paper to a native of English (or experts) for proofreading and corrections.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jackson Akpojaro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Africa, Nigeria</b>