

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_96146
Title of the Manuscript:	Kumaraswamy Generalized Inverse Pareto Distribution
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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. No. (see below). 6. Yes.</p> <p>In the equation (7),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i+1) should be inside of the summation You need to redefine k_i Second line in (7) is not correct. It should be revised based on the new k_i <p>The moments is based on equation (7). This section should be revised. For example, μ_r should have the summation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need revision.</p> <p>In abstract, "cases.The" should be "cases. The"</p> <p>In introduction, it should be etc. (not etc...)</p> <p>Below equation (1), dealing should be deal, flexibility should be flexible.</p> <p>Second page: "density functions.Numerous" needs space</p> <p>Third page "Equation (3), can be rewritten as follows" should be "Equation (3) can be rewritten as follows".</p> <p>Fourth page Simulating should be "simulating"</p> <p>"Which follows (4)" should be "which follows (4)"</p> <p>Fifth page Bowleyskewness should be "Bowley skewness"</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Junyi Dong
Department, University & Country	St Ambrose University, USA