

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_97055
Title of the Manuscript:	WEIBULL-INVERSE EXPONENTIAL [LOGLOGISTIC] A NEW 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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	I am pleased to inform you that the article entitled "Perceived Stress and Coping Strategies among Medical Students in a Tertiary Institution in Southwest Nigeria" is interesting, and suitable for publication, it is comprehensive, the manuscript is scientifically correct, the references sufficient and recent, and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.  Please look at the following additional points: 1. I recommend English revision. 2. I encountered some misprints, and a spellcheck is necessary. 3. The text is a bit unclear. 4. The scientific language needs extensive revision. 5. Review text formatation. 6. Some characters of equations were missed.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Thiago Rafael da Silva Moura</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Pará, Brazil</b>