

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_104949
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF CANONICAL AND GENERALIZED CANONICAL CORRELATION ANALYSIS USING SOME CONTINUOUS DISTRIBUTIONS
Type of the Article	Empirical/simulation/study of analytic methods

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very useful, since it sheds light into an important methods (canonical and generalized canonical correlation analysis) for comparing two samples, under different continuous distributions 2. Article title is adequate, yes 3. Abstract is fine but would suggest adding the main conclusion, i.e. that both methods perform equally 4. Yes, sections are meaningful and help set a different discussion every time this is warranted 5. The author(s) did a good job at deriving formulas and constructing a logical argument 6. Good references, up to date, and included seminal work that is relevant for the discussion 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the author(s) used proper language. That is not so say that some minor language, punctuation and verbal agreement is perfect – suggest submitting to professional editing 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Good job, relevant and interesting manuscript	

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> <p>Not applicable</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eric David Cohen
Department, University & Country	University of Campinas, Brazil