

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_118877</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bayesian Sequential updation and prediction using an Information criterion weighted prior</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The aim of the article is to analyze and predict a dependent variable using Bayesian sequential updating of priors. Specifically, the study constructs an information criterion-weighted prior and compares the performance of Bayesian multiple regression models under Student's t and log-normal error distributions. However, there are several points to consider for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kindly, you can change the paper title to be "Bayesian Sequential Updating and Prediction of Currency Circulation using an information Criterion-Weighted Prior" make the paper slightly more concise.</li> <li>2. In the abstract, the methodology and key findings are briefly mentioned, making it clear and informative. However, the abstract could be improved by briefly stating the significance of the findings and potential implications.</li> <li>3. introduction's literature review appears limited in scope and may rely on older references. A well-rounded literature review should include a comprehensive overview of recent advancements and key studies in the field.</li> <li>4. In the material and method section, some parts are quite technical and may benefit from more accessible language or additional explanations for readers less familiar with Bayesian methods. Visual aids or flowcharts could also help in illustrating the sequential process.</li> <li>5. The data and methodology section provides all necessary information for replicability.</li> <li>6. the discussion could be enhanced by interpreting the findings in a broader economic context and discussing their implications more thoroughly. Additionally, comparing the results with previous studies could provide a deeper insight into the study's contributions.</li> <li>7. the conclusion could be strengthened by discussing the practical applications of the study, any limitations encountered, and suggestions for future research. This would provide a more comprehensive end to the paper and suggest pathways for further investigation</li> <li>8. Having only four references in a research article is quite limited, especially for a study that involves complex methodologies like Bayesian sequential updating and prediction.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Asia Mahdi Naser Alzubaidi
Department, University & Country	University of Karbala, Iraq