

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMCS_98428 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Inference on the Parameters of Zubair-Exponential Distribution with Application to Survival Times of Guinea Pigs |
| 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | Yes, it is important as it proposes a more flexible distribution which may be able to model certain datasets not suitable to be modelled using other distributions. Yes Yes Yes References are sufficient | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | 1. In the Section 1 titled 'introduction' section of the paper, in the third line from the last, it should be 'in section 3, we derive the...' 2. Based on the behaviour of the pdf plots, reliability function and hazard function plots, some comments on the suitability of the distribution for modelling a particular kind of data set can be made. 3. In the sub figures within figure 2 and 3, the figure legends are overlapping with the curves within the plot area. 4. In section 3, where the authors have derived the m.g.f. of the proposed distribution, it may be seen whether the additive property is being satisfied or not. 5. Although the authors have considered several methods of estimation, both classical and Bayesian approach, the maximum likelihood method of estimation has been used for applying the distribution to real-life data set. The authors have not justified the choice of this method. 6. At least two applications could have been given by the authors for the proposed distribution so as to exhibit its utility. | |

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: | Sahana Bhattacharjee |
| Department, University & Country | Gauhati University, India |

Review Form 1.7