

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_107665</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Modelling Count Variables: A Comparative Analysis of two Discretization Techniques</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1) <b>Yes, this manuscript is important to the scientific community. I mention this because we always need statistics to predict and evaluate business performance indicators and description for growth.</b></p> <p>2) <b>Yes, the title is very suitable.</b></p> <p>3) <b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive breaking down the background, methodology, results and conclusion.</b></p> <p>4) <b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate for this research.</b></p> <p>5) <b>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6) <b>Yes, most of the references are sufficient and recent with the exception of a few.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, revision is needed when it comes to structural things discussed below:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>1) Abstract is present.</p> <p>2) Keywords are present.</p> <p>3) Quantitative Methodology is present.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>4) Some equations are not centered through the manuscript. All equations must be centered.</p> <p>5) References are not in alphabetical order. All references must be in alphabetical order to match the correct in-text citations.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tim Tarver</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bethune-Cookman University, United States of America</b>