

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_103326
Title of the Manuscript:	Buys-Ballot Estimates for Overall Sample Variances and their Statistical Properties: Mixed Model Case
Type of the 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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, The manuscript is important in the scientific community more so to the time series modeling that faces seasonality issues with multiplicative and mixed structures</p> <p>The title is suitable for the article</p> <p>The abstract is well outlined and comprehensive</p> <p>All subsections are well structured</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are well thought, selected and are recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is OK</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The last sentence in section 1 states "The proposed test is able to distinguish between the mixed and multiplicative models with a high degree of confidence."</p> <p>There is no evidence of this proposal in the results, conclusion, and recommendation of this manuscript. I would suggest that you make a comparison on both models</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:	Jacob Otieno Ong'ala
Department, University & Country	Namibia University of Science and Technology, Namibia