

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_107866</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>MODIFIED ROBUST ESTIMATORS OF POPULATION MEAN IN THE PRESENCE OF NON-RESPONSE AND MEASUREMENT ERROR</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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 REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In abstract the second line "An estimator is a statistic obtained from values in the sample in order to estimate certain characteristic such as the mean, variance, standard deviation, coefficient of variation etc." there is no need to add such a basic definition of initial terms in Statistics.</li> <li>2. In abstract abbreviate MSEs properly.</li> <li>3. The abstract is too lengthy. Remove extra sentences from the abstract, which have no need.</li> <li>4. In introduction section author missed the most latest and related articles to the non-response measurement error and use of the auxiliary information. Mentioned the below articles in the introduction section to increase the readability of the paper:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Bhushan, S., Kumar, A., &amp; Shukla, S. (2023). On classes of robust estimators in presence of correlated measurement errors. <i>Measurement</i>, 220, 113383.</li> <li>b) Zahid, E., Shabbir, J., Gupta, S., Onyango, R., &amp; Saeed, S. (2022). A generalized class of estimators for sensitive variable in the presence of measurement error and non-response. <i>Plos one</i>, 17(1), e0261561.</li> <li>c) Zahid, E., &amp; Shabbir, J. (2018). Estimation of population mean in the presence of measurement error and non response under stratified random sampling. <i>PloS one</i>, 13(2), e0191572.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. All equation numbers are assigned wrongly. Do not assign equation number on the basis of each section. Assign numbers to each equation systematically. On page 4 the authors mentioned equation (2.59). Where is the said equation in this article. Justify?</li> <li>6. Write the motivation of your work as compared to the existing estimators.</li> <li>7. Authors add Section 3 i.e. Efficiency comparisons of the proposed Estimators. Give numerical values to the all the condition using at least three actual data sets and a simulation study.</li> <li>8. During evaluating your paper, I observed that there is no use of actual data sets. Authors must ensure to use at least three actual data sets, for the purpose of checking the efficiency of the proposed estimators.</li> <li>9. The conclusion of the paper should need proper improvement.</li> <li>10. There is found lots of typos and grammatical errors, authors must need to read the paper very carefully.</li> <li>11. Authors should provide all the simulated codes for the purpose of evaluation.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	Sardar Hussain
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	Quaid-i-Azam University, Pakistan