

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_116749
Title of the Manuscript:	Almost unbiased estimators for population coefficient of variation using auxiliary information
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes The manuscript has great significance because the proposed estimators in the study can be utilized to provide better estimates when there exist variability within various phenomena such as inflation variation, exchange rate variation, standard of living variation and so on, for better policy-making.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, the abstract is not comprehensive and thus should contain the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objectives of the paper, 2. The datasets used in assessing the performances of the estimators, 3. The criteria adopted in assessing the performances of the estimators, 4. The conclusion drawn from the findings of the study and 5. Recommendations and suggestion. <p>Yes, but some corrections were given with regards to subsections.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References such as Ray, S. K., & Sahai, A. (1980) and Srivastava, S. K., & Jhaji, H. S. (1981) are not in line with APA6. In addition, the references are not sufficient and are too old. Therefore, the authors should review recent works such as Audu et al (2022). Almost unbiased variance estimators. Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice, 16:15 https://doi.org/10.1007/s42519-021-00226-8.</p> <p>General Observation Under methodology, the authors should include a new section called 'Theoretical Efficiency Comparison'. Under this section the theoretical condition under which the proposed estimators are efficient that the existinf estimators considered sholud be established.</p> <p>Under Result Section, empirical biases of the proposed and existing estimators using real datasets and simulated data sholud to be computed. In addition, the results obtained should be appropriately described.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but there is need to re-cast some sentences to bring out the actual meaning.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Isah Muhammad
Department, University & Country	Binyaminu Usman Polytechnic, Nigeria