

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_80920
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Generalization for Generalized Inverted Exponential Distribution with Real Data Applications
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper entitled "A New Generalization for Generalized Inverted Exponential Distribution with Real Data Applications" seems to be exploratory. It is very common to derive many distributions from the existing distributions. It has been made unnecessarily lengthy by giving detailed derivations, which are simple in nature and can be deleted.</p> <p>Also review of literature is missing in the paper. It should be included.</p> <p>In my opinion, the paper can be published if the author agrees to revise the paper as per my detailed comments, given below.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Page-1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The title should be made more appealing by replacing words "new generalization". It is not universally true but is applicable only with the author's data sets. ii. In the abstract, there is no need to mention moments, reliability function, hazard function etc. because once the moment generating function is obtained, all these can be directly evaluated. iii. In the introduction, there is a need to add "be" in the following sentence Some complex real phenomena need new lifetime distributions to modeled with. <p>Page-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please correct the 4th line in the first para: Recently Elgarhy et al. (2018), introduced the type II Topp-Leone- G family (for short TIITL-G) using the half logistic distribution as a generator instead of the gamma generator in the cdf of Ristic-Balakrishnan-G (10).this family was characterized by more flexible, which made it of interest to many researchers. ii. What is the use of writing the word distribution along with CDF and PDF in the following line? where $\alpha > 0$ is a shape parameter, $G(x)$ is a baseline CDF distribution and $g(x)$ is the baseline PDF distribution. iii. In the second para, last line, change the phrase "For example: Dey and Nassar (9). iv. The paper should have well documentation of the references as in para 3, the reference numbers are missing. This article aims to combining the works of Abouammoh and Alshingiti and Elgarhy et al. <p>Pages 5-9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There is no need to give all the derivations of various functions like moments etc. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Please give only MGF and moments can be deduced. The author is unnecessarily making the paper very lengthy Also there is no need of giving figure 1 and table 1 both. One of them can be deleted.</p> <p>Pages 9-11: Sections 3.7 to 3.9 can be trimmed off to give simple results. This not a new research.</p> <p>Pages 12-14: The derivation in sections 4 are not required. Directly results can be given, although these are not new research derivations.</p> <p>Page-19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conclusion is not clear neither grammatically nor statistically. It needs clear interpretation of the objective. It is not worth to simply derive a distribution and find properties and MLE of TIITLGIE distribution. Using the rainfall data, what exactly the author have achieved. ii. Also justify the last line that the TIITLGIE distribution provides better result than derived models. 	
Minor REVISION comments	There are few grammatical mistakes. Correct them.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kuldeep Kumar Saxena
Department, University & Country	University of Dodoma, Tanzania