

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
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>

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.	Establishing differences and links between certain probability distributions plays an important role in mastering the theory and relationship of common distributions. This paper studies the relationships between selected probability distributions and establishes a schematic relationship between these selected distributions to illustrate the links between some distributions. These distributions and their links are useful for modeling, predicting, and generally assigning probability distributions to random variables.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Analysis of the relationships between some discrete and continuous distributions based on algebraic calculus	
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 summary of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. 1.0 Introduction 2.0 Distributions of Probability 2.1 Distribution of Bernoulli 2.2 Binomial distribution 2.3 Hypergeometric distribution 2.4 Negative binomial distribution 2.5 Geometric distribution 2.6 Poisson distribution 2.7 Normal distribution 2.8 Exponential Family of Distribution 2.9 Chi-squared distribution 2.10 Gamma Distribution 2.11 Distribution of F 3.0 Relations between Selected Distributions 3.1 Relationship between binomial distribution and Bernoulli distribution 3.2 Relationship between Poisson Distribution and Exponential Distribution 3.3 Relationship between Binomial Distribution and Poisson Distribution 3.4 Poisson distribution as a limiting case of Negative Binomial Distribution 3.5 Approximation of hypergeometric distribution to Binomial Distribution	

Review Form 3

	<p>3.7 Relationship between Gamma Distribution and Normal Distribution 3.8 Relationship of F Distribution and Gamma Distribution 4.0 Scheme of selected distributions 5.0 Conclusion</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript has a clear and rigorous construction, which proves the scientific thinking of the author by revealing the formulated ideas, the scientific research methods used and the coherence of the obtained results. The author gives a new interpretation to old ideas.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are enough and quite recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language/english of the article should be reviewed, in particular the headings (sections and subsections).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Popescu Anamaria
Department, University & Country	University of Petroșani, Romania