

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_115306
Title of the Manuscript:	Bayesian Probabilistic Projection of Population Census in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Research Article

## 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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript studies Bayesian probabilistic projection of population census in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <p>In the last paragraph, you wrote “However, the major limitation is that if datasets were readily up-to 100 (hundred) sample points, the projection would have been more accurate than estimated.” What does this indicate and how will this enlighten the future path of relevant research? Moreover, I do not understand why being “more accurate” could be a limitation.</p>	<p>Actually, the more the dataset, the better the estimate. But the limitation would be removed from the conclusion.</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The English quality fulfils the standard of scholarly communications.</p> <p>Additional comments: Please keep the use of space consistent. They are currently random; for example, “inferences[1]” and “projections [10]”.</p> <p>“exp” in formulas should not be italicized.</p>	<p>This would be adjusted.</p>
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>I am not sure the style of this journal, but I think phrases such as “[13] investigated” “[8] studied” are weird. You may write “Sibly and Hone [13] investigated” “Obisesan et al. [8] studied” etc., but please confirm the submission guideline by yourself.</p> <p>I feel uncomfortable about the font size in some figures. Suppose you are the reader of this manuscript. Please enlarge the ones that annoy you. I believe most of them will.</p>	<p>The style was just used; however, it can be changed based on the journal's description.</p> <p>This would be adjusted.</p>

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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