

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_76929
Title of the Manuscript:	Note on quasi Lindley distribution: Some remarks and corrections
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	1) It is not ethical to directly make correction(s) on another person's (authors) work. 2) Do your own research by develop new distribution or modify the existing distribution or model and compare with others distributions in literature. 3) The abstract lacks many things, e.g abstract supposed to define a problem (like objectives), method and material you want to adopt and how you want to use them, findings and results and your conclusion. 4) That's why your keywords are not up to 5 and keyword in standard manuscript must be at least 5. 5) The references do not follow the journal format and more so, are not well arranged 6) The manuscript as it is needs thorough review by the author(s) as follows: a) The author(s) need to sit down and develop a new distribution or modify any existing distribution by adding new parameter(s) to the parameters of the existing model b) The author(s) must be able to derive the statistical properties of the distribution and make sure that the distribution exists i.e its pdf equal to one (1) c) Test it with set of life time data or simulation data and compare results with the existing literature to know if the distribution is better or not. d) and conclude accordingly. 7) By the time they do all the corrections the topic will automatically changed	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Badmus, N. I.</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Of Lagos, Nigeria</b>