

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_126645
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Efficiency of the Jackknife Kibria-Lukman M-Estimator: A Simulation-Based Comparative Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Outlier and multicollinearity problems are common assumptions violated in regression models. OLS is highly sensitive to outliers, to the extent that a single outlier is capable of deviating a large number of observation. Therefore, a robust estimator is required to overcome the situation. Jackknife Kibria-Lukman (JKL) M-Estimator is one of the robust methods that can cope with the effect of outliers and multicollinearity because it combines Ridge shrinkage matrix (Handling multicollinearity effect) and M-estimation (Handling outliers). So , I like the manuscript because it would aid analyst in choosing the best alternative to traditionally used OLS in the presence of multicollinearity and outliers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is quit OKAY.	
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.	Actually, the article abstract is comprehensive and precise.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are okay, except for the following: under section 2 MATERIAL AND METHOD <i>Performance evaluation</i> subsection was not giving a number, which is supposed to be 2.2.1 i.e under subsection 2.2 Monte Carlo simulation. Likewise, Simulation Scenarios supposed to be 2.2.2 and under subsection 2.3 Real-World Data Application, Dataset Description need to named 2.3.1 accordingly.	
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.	The study is scientifically robust and technically sound, because the proposed method used was compared with the existing applied methods and found to be best. Meaning that its filled the gap in the previous studies, by addressing the problems of multicollinearity and outliers. Likewise, the results of the simulation were validated with a real life data and found to be in the same vain. So, the study contributed in improving efficiency in the regression model.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The Quality of the English used in the article is Okay.	
Optional/General comments	For the Real data application i.e section 3.1, The regression model was not written, only the variables were stated. So, there is need to write the model first, then explanation of the respective variables.	

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:	Abdulmalik Mohammed
Department, University & Country	College of Education Dusten Tanshi Bauchi, Nigeria