

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_125287
Title of the Manuscript:	Interest Rate Risk Modelling Using Semi-Heavy Tail Distributions of Normal Variance-Mean Mixtures: Central Bank of Kenya Interest Rates.
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.	Generally, interest rate risk modelling enhances the understanding of economic dynamics which is essential for the growth and stability of the scientific community and its funding. I like the idea of this study, but I feel like the idea is not properly supported by literature or validated the importance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is ok, but it would be better if it can be more interested like, Application of Semi-Heavy Tail Distributions to Model Interest Rate Risk.	
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.	Abstract does not explain the significance of this study and key findings. It would be better if the conclusion is briefly explained.	
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.	This study doesn't compare or make a relationship between its finding and literature. An organized analysis is crucial to validate their findings or to establish the significance of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are not recent. I would like to see more up to date literature review.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Yeshan Withanage
Department, University & Country	Sri Lanka