

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_123898
Title of the Manuscript:	REGRESSION-IMPUTATION AND EWMA-BASED MEMORY TYPE MEAN ESTIMATORS IN THE PRESENCE OF NON-RESPONSE
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript interests to apply a new invented methodology to create the memory-type estimators tailored for surveys conducted. The work is scientifically important. The estimators given good results in estimating the EWNA application.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript interests to apply a new invented methodology to create the memory-type estimators tailored for surveys conducted. The work is scientifically important. The estimators given good results in estimating the EWNA application.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes , there are recent and sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes minor</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I ask some questions to author:</p> <p>1-From where the dataset were obtained.</p> <p>2- You do the estimation of dataset of alomair and shazhad 2023. The use of just one recent article is insufficient, and why you did not use yourself dataset.</p> <p>3-Have you do the comparison of obtained results with other application in order to conclude that the obtained EWNA statistics is robust?</p> <p>4-Why you did not calculate other function errors? MSE alone is insufficient.</p> <p>5- Can you precise the inputs and the output parameters in your study?</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Sediri Meriem
Department, University & Country	University of Medea, Algeria