

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_117052</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ON THE EFFICIENCY OF MODIFIED EXPONENTIAL DUAL TO RATIO-PRODUCT CUM TYPE ESTIMATOR UNDER STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLING USING TWO AUXILIARY VARIABLES</b>
Type of the Article	

**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 REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><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><b>Yes, Authors are recommended to revise the this very strongly to strengthen for further advancement.It is not recommended to accept in its present form.</b> Yes, EVLUATION OF EFFICIENCY OF MODIFIED EXPONENTIAL DUAL TO RATIO-PRODUCT-CUM TYPE ESTIMATOR UNDER STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLING USING TWO AUXILIARY VARIABLES <b>No,Abstract is not clear and it is not reflecting the outline of the paper.</b> <b>No, but the subject matter is not presented in a comprehensive manner. ButThis paper contributes to the body of knowledge.</b> <b>This paper is not technically sound.</b></p> <p><b>All the provided references are applicable and Sufficient</b></p> <p>It is highly recommended that authors modify this paper. In order to make stronger and more advancement. Acceptance in its current state is not advised. Authors are suggested to modify the title since it <b>not reflects the basic idea of the paper.</b></p> <p><b>Abstract is long and not clear</b> and it is not reflecting the outline of the paper. This paper is <b>not contributed to the body of knowledge</b> This paper is not technically sound and the subject matter is presented in a comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Authors are stated that <b>Moreover, Results eventually indicate the superiority of proposed estimators over existing traditional estimators mentioned in study. Therefore Researchers are highly recommended to use proposed estimators in practical application for estimating population mean</b>" Explain?</p> <p>Add keyword : <b>DUAL TO RATIO-PRODUCT-CUM TYPE ESTIMATOR, STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLING.</b></p> <p>Introduction section is not presented properly and authors should strengthen the introduction section.</p> <p>Some references are not appropriate for the topic being discussed and reference organization is very poor.</p> <p>Methodology section is also very weak. The authors should add <b>system model/flow chart/ algorithm</b> to present the system model in order to understand more clearly.</p> <p>Proposed System Models are not properly presented in section II and section III.</p> <p>Mathematical equations are not presented <b>with proper citations.</b> The result section seems to be very weak, the results were not compared with previous works</p> <p>Present the parameters used for simulation process in this paper in <b>a tabular form.</b></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>properly and the authors should compare with previous works that shows <b>out performance of the proposed results</b> with previous works.  <b>Comparison of results should be presented in Table</b> with proper citations.</p> <p>Authors are recommended to deeply revise the paper and should strengthen the paper strongly before resubmitting.</p> <p><b>Conclusion is not presented</b> clearly; the authors should strengthen the Conclusion that insights the basic findings and outlines of the paper.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>This paper contains some <b>typos and grammatical mistakes</b> and paper should be revised to strongly <b>edit</b> the paper before re-submitting.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Prasad Rayi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>International School of Technology &amp; Sciences, India</b>