

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_100930
Title of the Manuscript:	An Empirical Comparison of Power of Two Independent Population Tests Under Different Underlined Distributions
Type of the 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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>In this paper the most effective test for a given distribution and sample size is discussed. This paper reveals that when data are taken from a normal distribution and tested at small and large sample sizes, respectively, the t-test and Welch test have the highest power. Also this paper discusses that Man-Whitney test is the most reliable for exponential distributions.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It needs revision. The concept is good but not so clearly explained. On page no 5, in equation no. 3, some symbols are missing.</p> <p>Sufficient but not recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article needs revision. On page no. 7 , there seems to be some gap in 6th and 7th line, please recheck these lines.</p> <p>On page no. 7, The test's underlying presumptions need corrections. Please check again. On page no. 9 , in 4th to 6th line, the concept presented is not clear. On page no. 12 , Conclusion part also needs corrections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vandana Bansal
Department, University & Country	Ramgarhia College, GND University, India