

Review of: "Strategies for retaining customers: How PT ABC can maintain its position as the laboratory of choice"

Omid Abdolazimi¹

¹ Mississippi State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First, thanks for giving me this chance to review this paper. Personally, I think it is a good paper and fit with the journal; however, there are some points that I will mention in the following. I hope they would help improve the quality of the paper.

1- The main title seems not to be appropriate, it is better that the authors choose an attractive one.

2- About the abstract section, it needs to change a lot. I mean, the authors directly talked about the model, so they should add some sentences about explaining of the topic. Also, the authors should discuss the results at the end. Plus, the paper's main contributions should be brought in the abstract.

3- The keywords could be more appealing, so I suggest the authors change them into more attractive ones.

4- The introduction section is almost alright. However, some main points should be considered. It is necessary to use some recent references (at least after 2020) for covering this section. In addition, this section is better to divide into four paragraphs. The first two ones about the background and the history of the topic and some related investigations; the third paragraph about the motivation/contribution and the goals of the study; finally, the last paragraph is "The rest of this paper is organized as follows: ..."

5- The paper's motivations/innovations are insufficient, so they must be modified, and the authors should consider them carefully.

6- It is highly recommended that Sections 2 and 3 merge together; then move to the literature review section. Also, the authors should try to use recent publications (after 2021) in the literature review section. In addition, it is highly recommended that this section divide into some sub-section, and the last sub-section is "Research Gaps". Moreover, if the authors can add a table that summarize this section, it would be ideal for the convenience of the readers. Actually, it is better than the literature review reorganize completely and carefully.

7- The paper should be divided into the following sections:

Abstract,

Introduction,

Literature review,

Model description and assumptions

Solution methods

Results and discussion

Conclusion and future recommendations

In “Model description and assumptions,” it is recommended that binges the mathematical formulations, explanations about the model, and the related assumptions.

In “Solution methods,” all the suggested solutions should come there.

The assumption is better to be as some bullet points.

- Assumption 1;
- Assumption 2;
- Assumption n.

8- Sections 4 and 5 are too low, so the authors should extend them. Also, these two sections should be merged together and move to a new section, namely “Results and Discussions”. Besides, the length of the table in Section 4 is too long; therefore, it is better that the authors reduce it. All in all, these two sections must be considered and reorganized completely.

9- The conclusion section should be modified completely. It would be categorized into three paragraphs, including some explanations about the problem (paragraph I), the results and motivations of the study (paragraph II), and some future suggestions (paragraph III).

10- The language of the paper should be checked carefully for typos, grammatical errors, and the like.

11- All the references should be evaluated for their existence inside the paper.