

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript addresses a critical issue in survey sampling—handling non-response, which is a significant problem in collecting accurate data. The proposed ratio-type variance estimators are innovative and show promising improvements in efficiency over existing methods. The use of auxiliary information through positional parameters to improve these estimators is an important contribution, particularly for researchers facing incomplete datasets. However, improvements in language, structure, and clarity of presentation would further enhance the manuscript.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, but it can be slightly revised for clarity. Suggested title: "Efficient Handling of Non-Response in Sample Surveys: Development of Ratio-Type Variance Estimators"	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract should be more concise and focus on the key findings. It is recommended to reduce the description of methodology and emphasize the performance of the proposed estimators in comparison to existing ones.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections are appropriately organized. However, some sections (like methodology) could benefit from further elaboration for readability.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The derivation of bias and mean square error (MSE) for the proposed estimators is mathematically accurate and follows logically from the assumptions. The practical demonstration using real data further validates the theoretical findings, showing clear efficiency improvements.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	The references are relevant but should include more recent studies, particularly those published after 2017, to strengthen the literature review.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, the manuscript contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. A thorough proofreading is necessary to improve the readability. For example, "The present study has been under taken" should be corrected to "undertaken." Additionally, terms like "Positional parameters" should be clarified early for the readers.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper has the potential to contribute significantly to survey sampling research, especially in dealing with non-response. The methodology is well-founded, but enhancing clarity and expanding the discussion of practical applications would improve its impact.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Qasim Shah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Peshawar, Pakistan</b>