

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_125841
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF POPULATION MEAN UNDER DIAGONAL SYSTEMATIC SAMPLING SCHEME BY USING IMPUTATION METHODS
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This work offers valuable insights to the academic community, particularly in statistical analysis and sampling theory. The proposed estimators outperform several modern alternatives, demonstrating lower bias, reduced mean square error (MSE), and higher percentage relative efficiency (PRE). This contribution significantly enhances the accuracy and efficiency of estimators for population means in diagonal systematic sampling designs. The article's comprehensive empirical analysis is particularly noteworthy, offering both theoretical and applied researchers practical guidance on implementing these approaches in real-world scenarios.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is generally clear, but it could be made more concise and grammatically refined</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract offers an overall summary of the topic, though some sections are clearer and more comprehensive than others. It could benefit from a more concise presentation of the key results and conclusions, as it currently lacks sufficient detail regarding the findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, everything looks good.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor and technical soundness through its comprehensive analysis and well-structured empirical research. A detailed comparison of the biases, mean squared errors (MSEs), and percentage relative efficiencies (PREs) of the proposed estimators against existing ones is presented in Tables 2–5. The findings indicate that the proposed estimators generally outperform their predecessors, exhibiting lower MSEs and higher PREs in most cases. Despite a few newly introduced estimators underperforming, the overall results underscore the potential of these approaches to enhance estimation procedures in the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The list of citations included in the text seems to be rather extensive and covers a wide range of relevant literature. Suggestions for additional recent references: Yasir et al. (2020): Efficient estimation combining exponential and In functions under two phase sampling Yadav, R., & Upadhyaya, L. N. (2020). A new class of estimators for population mean using auxiliary information in systematic sampling. <i>Journal of Statistics and Management Systems</i>, 23(4), 739-749. Yasir et al. (2023): On Some New Exponential Ratio Estimator of Population Mean in Two Phase Sampling Kumar, R., & Singh, H. P. (2022). Advances in ratio-type estimators in systematic sampling: A review. <i>International Journal of Statistics and Applications</i>, 12(1), 55-68.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the article's language and English quality are appropriate for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Yasir Hassan
Department, University & Country	The University of Lahore, Pakistan