

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJPAS_105765 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Wider classes of estimators in Adaptive cluster sampling |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>The findings of this article have made a significant contribution to the body of knowledge because there are numerical analysis result demonstrated.</p> <p>The title should be more specific on the method use.</p> <p>The abstract should be concise and condensed, including an introduction, method, results, and conclusion.</p> <p>This article compares two different methodologies. The author has detailed every piece of evidence that supports their findings. I had hoped, however, for a more elaborate conclusion.</p> <p>The author have provide all the evidence towards their findings in detail. However I expecting more convincing on their conclusion regarding on their result.</p> <p>The reference list should be formatted correctly. Only 20% percent of the references are from the past five years.</p> <p>I discovered that there are a number of formatting errors include spelling errors. Before resubmitting the article, could you please check to see that the author has followed the formatting guideline?</p> <p>Would it be possible to put the flow chart in this article?</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Quite moderate. Please have native speakers proofread the entire content before sending.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Please check to see that the format for the figure, table, and list of references follows the requirements provided by the publisher.</p> | |

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: | Muhammad Shahimi Bin Ariffin |
| Department, University & Country | College of Computing, Informatics & Mathematics, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia |