



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJMCS/2222
Title of the Manuscript:	Joint Optimal Policy for Variable Deteriorating Inventory System of Vendor- Buyer Ordering With Trapezoidal Demand

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	*In the abstract there are some words that need to be separate, for example: numericallythat toplace offeredby Please fix them **There are several references in the paper text that are not included in the reference section. For example: Mehta and Shah(2003,2004) Raafat (1991) Shah and Shah (2000) Goyal and Giri (2001) Yang and Wee(2005) *** On page 11, injoint . Please separate them. ****On page 14, anddelay, Please separate them. *****There is one reference in the reference section that was not referenced in the paper text. See Gor et al. (2009) *****Please add the following references: [1] Cárdenas-Barrón L.E., The Economic production quantity (EPQ) with shortage derived algebraically, International Journal of Production Economics, Vol.70, No.3, pp. 289-292, 2001.	Corrected in the draft. Thanks. Included in the reference section. Thanks. Corrected in the draft. Thanks. Corrected in the draft. Thanks. Done. Thanks. Not Relevant. Sorry.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	[2] Cárdenas-Barrón L.E., Optimal ordering policies in response to a discount offer: Extensions, International Journal of Production Economics, Vol. 122, No. 2, pp. 774-782, 2009. [3] Cárdenas-Barrón L.E., Wee, H.M and Blos, M.F., Solving the vendor-buyer integrated inventory system with arithmetic-geometric inequality, Mathematical and Computer Modelling, Vol. 53, No. 5-6, pp. 991-997, 2011. [4] Widyadana, G.A., Cárdenas-Barrón L.E. and Wee, H.M., Economic order quantity model for deteriorating items and planned backorder level, Mathematical and Computer Modelling, Vol. 54, No. 5-6, pp. 1569-1575, 2011. [5] Teng, J.T., Cárdenas-Barrón L.E., Lou, K.R., The economic lot size of the integrated vendor-buyer inventory system derived without derivatives: a simple derivation, Applied Mathematics and Computation, Vol. 217, No. 12, pp. 5972-5977, 2011. [6] Cárdenas-Barrón L.E., The derivation of EOQ/EPQ inventory models with two backorders costs using analytic geometry and algebra, Applied Mathematical Modelling, Vol. 35, No. 5, pp. 2394-2407, 2011.	Not Relevant. Sorry. Added in the draft. Thanks. Not relevant. Sorry. Added in the draft. Thanks. Not relevant . Sorry.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Just a short note informing you that I have revised the paper. The paper develops an inventory model for determining the joint optimal policy for the vendor and the buyer is analysed when the inventory is subject to deterioration and demand is trapezoidal. The mathematical expressions, modelling, solution procedures, operations and numerical examples are performed carefully and the generated results and behaviour of the model are logical and correct. I think that the developed model is new to literature and provides an improvement to the state-of-the-art theory of EOQ models that merits publication. There are a few minor points that the authors need to fix. I suggest publishing the paper if and only if the authors do the suggestions that I made them in the Minor Revision comments author section.	Thanks.
---	---	----------------