

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_92398
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparison of the Pearson, Spearman rank, and Kendall tau correlation coefficients using quantitative variables
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>(1) At the bottom of p. 1, the author claims that "serious errors" can occur with Pearson and Spearman correlation when the assumption of normality is not met. Please explain what these "serious errors" are. Since Spearman correlation is based on ranks, then it seems to me that normality should not be required with the Spearman correlation. Perhaps continuity should be required with Spearman correlation but not normality. Please clarify.</p> <p>(2) I am confused that data are based on cotton (p. 2), but the author also states that data are "simulated" (middle of p. 2) based on "10, 20, and 30 observations." Thus, are the data real or simulated? If the data are simulated, then why are data from El-Hashash (2017) being used?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Are the authors willing to share a link to their computer code for generating these results?	
Optional/General comments	The paper is interesting and well-written.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Steven T. Garren
Department, University & Country	James Madison University, USA