

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_95897
Title of the Manuscript:	Classical and Bayesian estimation for the Dagum 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	I have found that the paper very good. The title, abstract and key words are good. In the introduction, the authors describe in a very good way, all the fundamentals with very good references, of the paper. The authors include an overview the Dagum distribution using good references. In Mathematical and Statistical Properties , the authors present all fundamental equations that are necessary to understand the paper. In Methods of Estimation, the authors describe, in a very well way, the proposed estimation methods. In Bayesian Estimators using Different Prior and Loss Functions, the authors show the risk function and K-loss function and the entropy loss function, and then, they have done a simulation study and a real case study, presented in tables of the paper. The conclusions of the paper are very interesting. The References are good.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Augusta Soares Machado
Department, University & Country	Brazil