

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_95104
Title of the Manuscript:	EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION ON THE EFFECT OF THE NUMBER OF RESAMPLINGS ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF BOOTSTRAP STANDARD ERROR USING RESPONSE TIME DATA
Type of the Article	Original research
Date received	December 20, 2022
Date due	December 26, 2022

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 1.6

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>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary The abstract is adequate, it represents the paper in its parts. Some editing is needed [see suggestions in attached Corrected Manuscript] The introduction and background are appropriate clear and streamlined. Used relevant references and updated to support the subject. However, more references are needed as suggested, and references are cited correctly. The Methodology representation is clear. Includes the model proposed and does clearly explain the work intended. Results are clearly represented in Tables and Figures and are sufficient to support the discussion. Discussion is adequate, clear and streamlined. Furthermore, it is validated with relevant citations. The conclusion and recommendations are clear. References Review carefully the references' write-up for consistency, completeness, and to match the journal's requirements... Minor Proofreading is needed</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:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon