

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125863
Title of the Manuscript:	Approach of Handling Non-Response problems in Sample Surveys
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

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.	It is seen that under all the type of surveys the problem of non-response or missing data is occurred. Due to availability of non-response the parameter estimates are affected. So, the statistician want to reduce the effect of non-response under survey sampling using different types of proposed estimators under different situations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, It should be "An Approach of Handling Non-Response problems in the Estimation of Variance under Survey Sampling"	
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.	Yes, Some grammatical errors are found, so correction is necessary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Section 2, needs appropriate font. Under section 5.1, the expression for the Bias and MSE is not elaborated. Under the section 6, there is no expressions are derived for Bias and MSE.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but the references are not in the proper format.	
Minor REVISION comments	No, it's need to grammatically correction for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Try to expresses your ideas clearly, both verbally and through writing, so you can do better in your field.	

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:	Anil Prajapati
Department, University & Country	Basic Education UP Basic Education Board, India