

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
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	Research

### **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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript will be helpful to the research community. It does work as a delta addition in the research carried out in the statistical estimation and bootstrapping.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Title of the article is okay.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Abstract of the article is not presented in a nice way. Continuity between the sentences is lost many of times. Some grammatical mistakes are also present in it. Rewriting the abstract would help in this case.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Subsections of the manuscript are fine. Currently, conclusion is too small in the manuscript. More elaborate conclusion would be helpful.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct and the conclusion drawn is also okay.</b></p> <p>6. <b>References used in the manuscript are too old. 4-5 recent references (between year 2019-2022) must be added in the list. Formatting of the References section is very poor. No same format is followed in writing any two references.</b></p> <p>7. <b>Overall formatting of the manuscript is very poor.</b></p> <p>8. <b>All the above mentioned suggestion must be implemented by the authors before communicating the acceptance and for publishing the article in the journal.</b></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. <b>Lot of grammatical mistakes are present in the manuscript.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Rewriting of the manuscript in better English with no grammatical mistakes/typo is expected in the final version, before it goes for the publication in future.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	No	

**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><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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Revati Shriram
Department, University & Country	Cummins College of Engineering for Women, India