

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_127881
Title of the Manuscript:	Inverse Monsef distribution: Statistical Properties, Estimation and Application
Type of the Article	Manuscript

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The proposed distribution determines flexibility in modeling certain types of lifetime data. It is helpful in the field of medical science.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	Yes. Some reason may be provided to propose the new distribution.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The year of already existed distribution mentioned in the third sentence of introduction is the wrong one, it needs to be rechecked. The only parameter of proposed distribution is described as λ while in equation (1) and in all equations after that parameter notation is changed. Scientifically the variable name should be changed as described before equation (3) that random variable $1/y$ is taken, while the distribution is described with variable x . In figure 1 and 2, different values of theta are not described clearly. In section 2.4, distribution of rth order statistics is need to revise.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some typo errors and grammatical errors are observed in Introduction.	
Optional/General comments	In simulation study why theta is taken as 0.5, 1 and 1.5, while for graphical presentation, it is taken differently. Conclusion may need to elaborate.	

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:	Naila Amjad
Department, University & Country	Lahore College for Women University, Pakistan