

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_126107
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Modified Confidence Interval Estimate of Mean for Skewed Distribution: Applications and Simulation
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article focuses on estimation and statistical inference	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A New Modified Confidence Interval Estimate of Mean for Skewed Distribution Data: Applications and Simulation Approach	The title has been changed. Two reviewers suggested minor changes in the Title. Following the other reviewer's comment, the title has been changed to "A new modified confidence interval estimator of location parameter for skewed distribution"
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.	OK	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, for instance, 2. Methods should change to Literature review. The last paragraph under 2. methods should be moved to 1. Introduction in the last paragraph. 3. New proposed t-ci should change to methodology, 3.1 should be named as New proposed t-ci, 3.2 should be named as the point estimate of μ . 3.2 should change to 3.3 and 6. conclusion: should change to 6. Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Section 2. Methods have been changed to Literature review.- Last paragraph of Section 2 has been moved to 1. Introduction as last paragraph. 3.- 3. New proposed t-ci has been changed to 3. Methodology
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to the fact that the estimators were evaluate using live and simulation data which generated from skewed distribution data	It's a very strong positive comment, nothing suggested new.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	references are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor revision All active voice should change to passive voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Revision has been done by taking all suggestions into account and doing modifications accordingly- In all sections, active voice has been changed to passive voice
Optional/General comments	Author was not consistence with the abbreviation See Table 2, under methods as well as its discussion. Also See the abstract. Conclusion should be re-addressed	Abbreviation has been made consistent as recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none">- in Table 2- in Abstract- and all other sections from the beginning to the end. Conclusion has been revised and re-addressed.

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- There are no ethical issues in relation to this article.- All recommended modification has been taken care of, which has improved the presentation of the article to a great extent.- Authors would like to thank the reviewers and editor for their valuable suggestions and recommendations towards the improvement of the article.