



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                      |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>                                           |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEMT_40292                                                                                        |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Optimal Allocation of Funds for Loans using Karmarkar's Algorithm: Capital Rural Bank, Sunyani-Ghana |
| Type of the Article      | Original 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( <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> ) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments |                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | Tables 2... the source of information is missing. The author should rework the conclusion .                                                                               | Thanks for the comments. The source of Table 2 is provided. The conclusion has been worked on                                                                                         |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | The author showed a good knowledge of the area of interest. He applied a robust method of an analysis, including the logical analysis. The paper is good for publication. |                                                                                                                                                                                       |