

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_104427
Title of the Manuscript:	A new estimator of Shannon entropy with application to goodness-of-fit test to normal distribution
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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
--	---------------------------	--

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1- Every attempt to build better or faster estimators is important and gives future scientist new tools to analyse datasets. This paper fulfils this objective. Shanon entropy is relevant and new estimators are always welcome</p> <p>2- The title is correctly choose.</p> <p>3- The abstract is comprehensive of all the content included in the paper.</p> <p>4- Subsections and structure I correct.</p> <p>5- This manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6- References are sufficient, but could be more update. The newest if from 2017.</p> <p>7- With the aim that the work is more self-contained, proof of theorem 2.1 should be write in full extension instead of referring to a paper in the references.</p> <p>Table 1 caption contains the word empirival.</p> <p>The word integar few lines before 1.2 formula</p> <p>In section 4, the word havine has to be corrected. In the next line the word statndard.</p> <p>Also in section 4, p values of that inferences is better description of performance than stating rejections at a certain level only.</p> <p>A word on the simulation software used will enrich the work. Also a justification of some chooses. Sample sizes 10, 20, 30. Those distributions, standar normal, exponential and uniform.</p> <p>Tables could be summarize in graphics, also the behaviour respect to window size m could have a more deeply analysis. For example RMSE in uniform distribution decrease monotonic for HE estimator, but HM estimator shows a minimum for some window sizes. Also a mention on RSME and bias, minimum RSME not always mean minimum bias (because bias compensate with the sign).</p> <p>Introduction's first sentence uses the word function several times. This could rephrased.</p> <p>Table 4 should explain to wich distribution correspond each of three rows set. You could find this checking minimuns in previous tables, but mentioning it is a readability improvement</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1- English quality is correct.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>José Manuel Bavio</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina</b>