

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_105378
Title of the Manuscript:	Component Analysis and Identification of Ancient Glass Products Based on Statistical Methods
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The authors elucidated the process of analyzing and identifying ancient glass artifacts through the adaptable application of statistical techniques. They underscored four specific statistical approaches: the systematic clustering algorithm, K-means algorithm, logistic regression model, and grey correlation analysis. By employing a correlation matrix, the authors successfully discerned the chemical constituents within ancient artifacts.</p> <p>The title of the article appears quite appealing.</p> <p>The abstract distinctly outlines all the objectives and results.</p> <p>The sections are organised properly.</p> <p>The manuscript contains few errors that require attention. Specifically, the characteristics were plotted without axes, and the figures need to be of higher resolution. Additionally, a thorough comparison with existing research articles is necessary to substantiate the enhanced outcomes</p> <p>Sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some grammatical errors are there in the manuscript, authors need to correct it.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Mahiban Lindsay
Department, University & Country	Hindustan University, India