

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_96810
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Discrete Analogue of Complementary Exponentiated-G Poisson Family of Distributions: Properties and Estimation</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript made a discretization of an existing lifetime distribution called complementary exponentiated-G Poisson family. Properties of this distribution were derived. Maximum likelihood estimators were found. A simulation study and three real data sets were carried out.</p> <p>So, it is not so important in the literature, since a lot of new lifetime distributions with good characteristics were found.</p> <p>2. Suitable.</p> <p>3. No. It should be modified to say that some special lifetime distributions were considered. Also, it should be added that it is not a proposed distribution, it is just a discretization of an existing one.</p> <p>4. Section 4 with all subsections should be added. It is not necessary to deal with special cases, since the properties were found to the parent distribution.</p> <p>5. Scientifically, yes but importantly, not.</p> <p>6. Sufficient and recent.</p> <p><b>Additional Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In page 4: refer to the appendix, when comment on <math>h(x)</math>. Also, you should explain why <math>h(x) \leq 1</math>, not <math>\infty</math>.</li> <li>- Explain what is <math>rh(x)</math> in page 4.</li> <li>- There is no need to introduce "The Discrete Zubair -G Family" as a special case of complementary exponentiated-G Poisson family, then a special case "DZW", followed by other two special cases of "DZW"; "DZEX" and "DZR".</li> <li>- Tables 1, 2, and 3 should be deleted. There is no importance of getting the mean, median, ... and so on of DZW.</li> <li>- The comments after these three Tables are redundant. How can the numerical values of the measures of a certain distribution give an indication about its uses, flexibility, and beneficiaries?</li> <li>- In Tables 4, 5 and 6, instead of using the values of "r" equals to "n", which is the complete sampling case, it is better to use another values.</li> <li>- Table 7 could be merged with Table 6. But, where are the Tables match for Tables 4 and 5.</li> <li>- The concluding remarks are expectable. Getting better results when increasing the sample size is always the case whatever the distribution.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English language is suitable, except for some errors that should be corrected before publication, like for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Verb to be "is", should be used instead of "are"; as in the abstract "Method of maximum likelihood are".</li> <li>- It is better to use complete words, like "it is", instead of "it's" in page 3.</li> <li>- The infinitive "obtain" comes after to in page 4, not the gerund "obtaining".</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be revised according to the above comments</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hanan Mohamed Aly Hasan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cairo University, Egypt</b>