

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_87563
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF GOAL PROGRAMING FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF A LISTED INDUSTRIAL GOODS FIRM IN NIGERIA
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:

(<https://www.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	First of all, I would like to thank the editors for the opportunity they have offered me to review this manuscript and I am very pleased to cooperate with them. After reading the manuscript, I congratulate the authors for the work they have done, which I found quite interesting to read and analyze. Thus, the language used as well as the development of the same have been correct and easy to understand. I would also like to point out that it would be convenient to complete and justify the literature review, since it is scarce and incomplete. Regarding the methodology applied and the results achieved, I cannot advise modifications because they have already been published. It would be advisable to modify them before making suggestions about them. Likewise, the conclusions are quite reduced and need to be completed with the justification of the subject treated as well as providing details of the results obtained. I also recommend adding the limitations and future lines of research of the analysis carried out. Based on all the above comments, I recommend rejecting the manuscript.	I quite agree with the submissions of this Reviewer. The other issues have been addressed in my review
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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