

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123076
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Model-Assisted Estimators: A Comparative Study in High-Dimensional Survey Data
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 (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 holds substantial value for the scientific community, especially in the realms of survey sampling and high-dimensional data analysis. It presents a thorough comparative analysis of model-assisted estimators, which play a pivotal role in enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of population parameter estimates when dealing with high-dimensional auxiliary data. By examining various estimators, including machine learning-based models like Random Forest and CART, the study offers critical insights into their performance across different scenarios. Additionally, it underscores the challenges and opportunities in selecting suitable estimation methods for complex data structures, making it an essential resource for researchers and practitioners aiming to refine survey-based inference techniques</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title looks like relevant</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>Its need to review in different segments i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar • Define Estimator model “ CART” • Write related Keywords Like MSE/ RRMSE, Variance/ RE 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Structure of the manuscript is fine but in the introduction section need more detailed information and clearly mention the research gap and the goals of the research</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 demonstrates a high level of scientific rigor and technical soundness, owing to its meticulous methodology and extensive evaluation of a range of model-assisted estimators. The empirical analysis, based on 2,000 samples with 50 observations each, provides a robust foundation for assessing estimator performance. By employing multiple performance metrics, including Relative Bias, Relative Root Mean Square Error, and Relative Efficiency, the study offers a comprehensive and nuanced evaluation of the estimators under investigation. The integration of both conventional and machine learning-based estimators, combined with a stepwise variable selection process, reflects a sophisticated and methodologically rigorous approach. Moreover, the results are thoughtfully framed within the context of high-dimensional data, further substantiating the scientific credibility and relevance of the study's findings</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No, I think need to add more recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need to improve</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Muhammad Zeeshan
Department, University & Country	Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan