

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ CJUST _107238
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF STRESS STRENGTH RELIABILITY P [Y < X < Z] OF LOMAX DISTRIBUTION UNDER DIFFERENT SAMPLING SCHEME
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important in scientific community as it allow estimation of stress strength reliability for a component with a strength independent of opposite lower and upper bound stresses when the stresses and strength have Lomax Distribution.</p> <p>ESTIMATION OF STRESS STRENGTH RELIABILITY P [Y < X < Z] BASED ON LOMAX DISTRIBUTION UNDER DIFFERENT SAMPLING SCHEME</p> <p>The abstract is very short. The author should briefly mention the problem and the results.</p> <p>Okay.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The reference are sufficient and recent (2022, 2021 etc.)</p> <p>The author should clearly outline the advantage of Lomax distribution in estimation of stress strength reliability compared to others distribution such as Kumaraswamy Distribution. The author should mention the shortcoming of the previous estimation of stress strength reliability and his main contribution.</p> <p>The censoring schemes are missing in the simulation Study. The author should include the results of different censoring schemes (e.g. 30%, 50% censored data) with different sampling schemes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Suitable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	A well written paper.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John Kung'u
Department, University & Country	Laikipia University, Kenya