



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_46546
Title of the Manuscript:	Supply Chain Optimization for Farmer-Bepari system of Agricultural Products in Bangladesh.
Type of the Article	Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>Please refer to comments in the manuscript (attached in email) for detailed remarks [total remarks in reviewed manuscript: 30]. A summary is presented below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a considerable need to improve the standard of English in the paper. 2. A lot of remarks by the author require relevant references. Some have been mentioned in the reviewed manuscript. 3. Although a good background of the Bangladesh farming system is made, the claims made require backing by a relevant respiratory (ies). 4. Research question is not clearly cited. 5. References of the studies have been given but most of them seem to be irrelevant with the current study. 6. MILP models of other relevant studies may also be discussed in the introduction section. 7. A schematic representation of the considered supply chain may be included for clarity. 8. A schematic for the solution process including AMPL, Gurobi and Cplex may also please be added. 9. Why is brand and bound algorithm used? Comments / studies on its effectiveness through comparison with other studies are not identified. 10. Algorithm efficiency is not addressed. 11. As no comparative studies have been referred, comments on conclusion of the study cannot be provided. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Overall structure of the paper may be improved for clarity.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Kamal Amjad
Department, University & Country	National University of Sciences and Technology, Pakistan