

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_92665
Title of the Manuscript:	Separate Ratio Estimator Using Calibration Approach for the Population mean in Stratified Random Sampling
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) There is the needs to improve the introduction section to accommodate the review of recent articles. The most current article reviewed was a 2017 publication. (ii) The statement in the conclusion "In this paper, we obtained some new optimal stratum weights for which the estimator would achieve a minimum MSE or variance" is confusing. The MSE is stronger than the variance as a measure of performance. Therefore, the variance should not be mentioned. (iii) The conclusion should be improved by clearly describing the results and contribution of the article. (iv) The statement in the conclusion "Table 3 and Table 5 shows that the proposed calibration estimator gives better estimates as compared to the existing calibration estimator" is vague and difficult to understand. Therefore, author should make a better interpretation of the results. (v) The referencing style is not clear and inconsistent. The author should check previous publications of the Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics to correct the reference section. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Flow of grammar needs to be improved. Some statements are not coherent, while some paragraphs are difficult to understand.	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. S. Adekeye
Department, University & Country	Redeemer's University, Nigeria