

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_129329
Title of the Manuscript:	Jump-Preserving Estimation and Jump Detection for Nonparametric Model with Missing Data in the Covariate
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: 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 research is very good and has clear scientific ideas and is worth reading, in addition to a great effort by the researcher in achieving the main goal The research and through reading it reached the following positive results: 1- Introducing a new estimator for estimating non-parametric non-continuous models with missing data. 2- High efficiency in estimation. 3- Proving high efficiency through simulation to estimate performance in limited samples. 4- Studying the effect of sample size on performance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the manuscript is very appropriate.	
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.	The summary is clear and good, but I think if the researcher added the sample size values and the standard deviation values chosen by simulation, it would have been clearer.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The Reference are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is very good but I have a few notes: 1- Lack of direct comparison with other methods 2- Not providing details about the simulation algorithm. 3- Not studying the effect of different levels of standard deviation, these levels are clearly spaced to study the extent of the effect of standard deviation more clearly. 4- Do not apply real data to the model. I think there is no plagiarism.	

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:	Haifa Taha Abd
Department, University & Country	Mustansiriyah University, Iraq