

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJPAS_86198 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | On the Estimation of Stress Strength Reliability Parameter of Weibull- Rayleigh Distribution |
| 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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>Section 2,1,2, needs serious edition, After first paragraph the sentence is incomplete , and "WHERE ..." is not connected to the text.</p> <p>Further, on page 6 quantiles are wrong named namely 'FIRST AND Second" are wrong. Further. The scenes and Cortese's are defibbed via moments of the random variables. Authors use quantiles instead. I think, there is a need of better explanations, and soe reasons f or their choice of numeric illustration and incomplete calculations. In other words "and what?"</p> <p>There is NO CHARACTERIZATION OF THE WRD !!! Authors just derive the LST on p. 8. Just be modest and call the thins done with Theis real names.</p> <p>On page 9, equation IS NOT THE MODE of the WRD. Its solution, which authors do noy show, is the mode. Must be specified.</p> <p>Expressions (37) and (38) have no meaning. Must be explained, noy hanging in the aur.</p> <p>Same NO MEANING in expressions numbered as (44) – (46). Very unprofessional writing of the entire section 2.3. R is NOT A PARAMEEER, this is their NOTATION FOR RELIABILITY.</p> <p>In expressions (60) – (62) there is NO EQUATION. Authors call these "equations" Must REODO</p> <p>The whole language if this article as I noticed above, including the section 2.4. There are no equations in (65)-(67). Hy these expressions are numbered?</p> <p>The figures in Section 3, need explanation and precise discussion Especially Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Also what is the meaning of reliability there? The numeric data also need interpretation. Each value has magnitude to be compared and interpreted. Numbers are not silent witnesses, they should be interpreted as what they contribute as facts in the studded case.</p> <p>Authors miss this important stuff.</p> <p>And in the conclusions I see again the claim that thay give a characterization of the WRD. No this is not true. They analyse some properties, andthis is not equivalent to characterization.</p> <p>Article seems mathematically correct, and very poorly written.</p> <p>I would recommend it for publication after a serious revision and corrections.</p> <p>Maybe they will use mu remarks to improve the presentation.</p> | <p>My compensate given on the left .</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> <p>Needs serious re-work/.</p> | | |

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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Boyan Dimitrov</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>Kettering University, USA</p> |