

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJPAS_126940 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Efficiency Analysis of Public and Private Sector Banks in India using Slack-Based Measure of Efficiency |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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) |
|---|---|---|
| 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. | It is a science based research. Statistical analysis made it to fit for scientific community. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Ok | |
| 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. | Comprehensive | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| 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. | It is robust because of its statistical impact and significance | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Suitable | |
| Optional/General comments | Satisfactory and publishable | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Micheal Vincent Abiodun |
| Department, University & Country | Federal Polytechnic Bida, Nigeria |