Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPAS_90231**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Performance Comparison of Imputation Methods for Mixed Data Missing at Random with Small and Large Sample Data Set with Different Variability**
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)

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	Accept with very minor revision	
Minor REVISION comments	Please make revision as suggested	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript entitled "**Performance Comparison of Imputation Methods for Mixed Data Missing at Random with Small and Large Sample Data Set with Different Variability**" is very interesting. The manuscript assesses the best multiple imputations by chain equation (MICE) procedure for handling missing data for large and small mixed data sets with different variability and with different percentage levels of missingness. Several methods have been proposed on how to handle missing data and can be broken down into two categories: traditional and modern methods. I hope the proposed methodology can allow the research community and academicians to predicts the missing value, and the estimated response value replaces the missing data. This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing an Original Research Article. All references have been properly and correctly cited. The results and discussions have been presented properly according to the rules of good and correct writing. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Yusuf Suryo Utomo**
Department, University & Country	**Indonesia**