

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_127675
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling COVID-19 Pandemic Data with New Pareto Model
Type of the Article	Original research 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: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript proposed a New Extended Pareto Model. The model provides a good alternative in modelling the Covid-19 pandemic in various countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Modeling the Mortality rate of Covid-19 pandemic using A New Extended Pareto Model	
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.	On the last line of the abstract, it would be better to remark that "THE MODEL PERFORMS BETTER THAN THOSE WITH WHICH IT WAS COMPARED" than saying "IT IS BEST FOR MODELING COVID 19 DATA".	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>YES but deficient in content. I suggest the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comparing the new model with only the baseline Pareto model greatly limits its contribution to knowledge. The author(s) should explore further and compare the proposed model with a few other models such as the generalized beta exponentiated Pareto type I (GBEP) model, the generalized beta Pareto (GBP), the Kumaraswamy exponentiated Pareto (KEP), Kumaraswamy Pareto (KP), beta exponentiated Pareto (BEP), beta Pareto (BP), exponentiated Pareto (EP) among several others. This will enhance the robustness of the article.</li> <li>2. Some other structural properties such as the moment generating function, quantile function, mean deviations, explicit expression of the moments, Re'nyi entropy etc. of the new model should be derived.</li> <li>3. The parameter <math>\lambda</math> (line 95) was not mentioned anywhere in the article. What it represents should be well explained.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. However first time citations such as [1] on page 1 line 28, [2] on page 2 line 30 etc. should include the name of all authors of cited material.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. However the article contain a number of grammatical errors. Revision required.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is publishable with major revisions.	

**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:	Edike Nnamdi
Department, University & Country	Ambrose Alli University, Nigeria