

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important because the authors have contributed to knowledge by making a comprehensive research 2. Buys- Ballot Estimates for Overall Sample Variances and their Statistical Properties : A Mixed Model Case 3. The abstract is comprehensive because it gives a brief detail of what the article entails 4. Article is well structured but the 3 should be (3.0 simulation result using mixed model and also the methodology should be 2.0 instead of 2) 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references should be allowed to remain as it is. Nevertheless, there is a need to update the reference by citing references that are not older than 5- 10 years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language is correct and the English used is simple and academic like	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sulayman Muhammad Kabeer
Department, University & Country	University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia