Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPAS_98017**
Title of the Manuscript:	**On Zero-Truncated Negative Binomial with Excess Ones**
Type of the 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)

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)*
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)**	**1. Yes. The paper compared zero truncated negative binomial with excess ones to other distributions such as compared zero truncated negative binomial and compared zero truncated Poisson distribution.** **2. Yes.** **3. Yes.** **4. Yes.** **5. No. I don't believe it is correct. The computation is based on (5), the likelihood function. However, (5) is not correct.** **Corollary 1: when w -> 0, E[J] -> mu = E[J>1]. It is not correct. Also E[J>1] is not clear. Do you mean E[J | J>1]?** **(5) is wrong. It is not the likelihood function.** **6. Yes.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. No. Some sentences are not clear. For example, Page 1. The Negative Binomial distribution [1], Generalized Poisson models and Com-Poisson model [2] **as well as** the Negative Binomial-Sushila linear model [3], negative binomial-weighted Lindley distribution [4], a new Generalized Poisson mixed distribution [5] are some of the distributions proposed to account for over- and under-dispersion, which are common scenarios in count data. Most recently there were the Zero-truncated negative binomial-Erlang distribution [8] **and** a zero-truncated distribution [9] and Lagrangian Zero-truncated Poisson Distribution [10] among others. hence, the essence of this study. (not a sentence) 2. In (3) and (4), it should be f(j | k, p). In defitinion 1, it should be f(1 | k, p) not f(0 |k, p). In (4), domain should be j = 1 and j = 2, 3, …. 3. Why the df for ZTP is 6? 4. No big difference between ZTNB and ZTNBw based on the plot. Why do you conclude that ZTNBw is better?	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Junyi Dong**
Department, University & Country	**Saint Ambrose University, USA**