

### 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>	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it introduces new estimators for finite population variance, demonstrating their superior performance in both the presence and absence of non-response. Though, the manuscript has several shortcomings, including a weak abstract and a brief introduction, while the literature review lacks depth and comprehensiveness.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is generally suitable, but it could be made more specific to enhance clarity.	
<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 study's goals and procedures are succinctly summarised in the abstract, but further information on the research's conclusions and ramifications would be helpful.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Structure of manuscript is okay but there are some technical issues in paper for example in proposed estimators what are <math>D_3</math>, <math>D_4</math> and <math>D_5</math>?</b>	
<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 work has some scientific rigour and technical effort, but more depth and clarity might be added to its analysis. Although the empirical study is organised, it could not adequately represent the intricacies of the subject matter. Currently, only one population is being tested, whereas it would be beneficial to evaluate 3 to 4 populations for more accurate results. Additionally, the relative efficiencies of the proposed estimators are not included in Table 2 and Table 5.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references provided in this manuscript are a mix of both older and more recent works, but there is room for improvement in terms of recency and relevance. To strengthen the literature review, I suggest including more recent studies from the last five years that focus on advanced estimation techniques and their applications, particularly in the context of non-response issues in sampling. Additionally, ensuring that references cover a broader range of methodologies and theoretical advancements in survey sampling would enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. Suggestions for additional recent references: Yasir et al. (2023): On Some New Exponential Ratio Estimator of Population Mean in Two Phase Sampling Kumar, R., & Singh, H. P. (2022). Advances in ratio-type estimators in systematic sampling: A review. <i>International Journal of Statistics and Applications</i> , 12(1), 55-68.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the article's language and English quality are appropriate for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Yasir Hassan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The University of Lahore, Pakistan</b>