

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_125445
Title of the Manuscript:	ON THE EXTENDED XLINDLEY DISTRIBUTION: ITS PROPERTIES AND APPLICATION TO LIFETIME DATA
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.	Authors have tried to generalize a distribution by incorporating one more parameters in the baseline distribution that will help in understanding the things to researchers, academicians etc. Script will be found to be good contribution in the field of generalization of lifetime distributions. SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. As per my suggestions, it should be EXTENDED XLINDLEY DISTRIBUTION: ITS PROPERTIES AND APPLICATION TO LIFETIME DATA	
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.	Yes, Abstract is comprehensive. I have corrected and suggested at required place.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On applying the weighted version, the third parameter indexed, to this distribution, it is expected to be more flexible to describe different lifetime data than its sub-models. 2. The results from table 3 and 4 revealed that WQXLD produced low values in -LL, AIC, AICC, HQIC and BIC which shows that comparatively WQXLD is more efficient than the existing models considered. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Dear Editors, There are some MINOR REVISIONS for the improvement of this script which are as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are numerous typo mistakes found in the script that I have highlighted and mentioned using sticky notes. Authors must have to correct it accordingly.2. Authors Must be correct the text by following the suggestions in sticky notes in the manuscript.3. Authors should use the symbols of alpha, beta and gamma in the figures, if possible. <p>JUSTIFICATIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Authors uses only MLE method why they have not been considered other methods for comparative study? Please, justify the same.2. Authors have considered only real data application for the flexibility of the considered models why not considered simulation study? Please give clarifications about the same.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After above incorporations script will be better.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pawan Kumar
Department, University & Country	GSVM Medical College, India