

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJOM_100224</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exponentiated Power Lindley-Logarithmic Distribution and its Applications</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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>yes</li> <li>yes</li> <li>yes.</li> </ol> <p><b>But the author should not say “the model provides a better fit to lifetime data sets than other competing models”. It is only doing better in your simulation.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>yes</li> <li>no (see below)</li> <li>yes</li> </ol> <p><b>Author should check the formula again</b></p> <p>Page 2 (11): missing summation</p> <p>Page 2 (13): it is not the correct pdf.</p> <p>Page 3 (15): it is not the correct hazard function</p> <p>Page 4 (19) It is not correct</p> <p>Page 4 above (21) equation is not complete</p> <p>Page 5 (25) first equation is not correct</p> <p>Table 1 what are a, b, c, d?</p> <p>Based on figure 3, there is not big difference between EPLLD and EPLD. Why the p-value for EPLD &lt; 0 ?</p> <p>Figure 4: EPLLD QQ plot is wrong.</p> <p>Page 8 and 9, the fitted CDF for EPLD, EPLLD, and Weibull are the same.</p> <p>Figure 10, aren't these four plots the same?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Page 1, first line in section 2: the probability density function (pdf) of the Lindley distribution.</p> <p>Page 2, below (6), suppose that the random variable, X, has ....</p> <p>Suppose N is discrete and follows the zero-truncated ...</p> <p>Page 2 (12) F is repeated.</p> <p>Also change log<sub>e</sub> to ln</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Junyi Dong</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>St Ambrose University, USA</b>