

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_125663
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG SOME SELECTED PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	This manuscript provides a valuable review and analysis of relationships between common probability distributions. It is important for the scientific community as it consolidates key information about various distributions, their properties, and interconnections in one comprehensive resource. The algebraic derivations and schematic diagram help clarify the links between distributions. However, the manuscript could benefit from more discussion of practical applications and examples to make it more accessible to a broader audience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "A REVIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG SOME SELECTED PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS" is suitable but could be more specific. A suggested alternative: "A Comprehensive Review of Relationships and Transformations Between Common Probability Distributions"	
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.	The abstract is fairly comprehensive but could be improved. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify which distributions are covered</li> <li>Briefly mention some key relationships/transformations found</li> <li>Add a sentence on practical implications/applications of understanding these relationships</li> </ul>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure are generally appropriate, progressing logically from introduction to individual distributions to relationships between them. However, the manuscript could benefit from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clearer delineation between sections on individual distributions and sections on relationships</li> <li>A separate "Methods" section explaining how relationships were derived</li> <li>A "Discussion" section synthesizing key findings and implications</li> </ul>	
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 manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The mathematical derivations of relationships between distributions seem correct and well-explained. The inclusion of both discrete and continuous distributions provides good coverage. The schematic diagram in Figure 3 effectively summarizes key relationships visually. However, more rigorous statistical justification for some of the approximations and limiting cases would strengthen the scientific validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references seem sufficient and include some recent sources. However, inclusion of more recent review papers or textbooks on probability distributions (e.g. from the last 5 years) would strengthen the bibliography. Some suggested additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forbes, C., et al. (2011). Statistical distributions. John Wiley &amp; Sons.</li> <li>Nadarajah, S., &amp; Kotz, S. (2006). R Programs for Computing Truncated Distributions. Journal of Statistical Software, 16(2), 1-8.</li> </ul>	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be corrected. A thorough proofreading by a native English speaker would improve readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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:	Joseph D. Reyes
Department, University & Country	Philippines