

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
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	

**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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 <b>Data:</b> Applications and Simulation <b>Approach</b>	
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 $\mu$ . 3.2 should change to 3.3 and 6. conclusion: should change to 6. Conclusion	
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	
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	
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	

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:	Ibrahim, Suleman Adeniyi
Department, University & Country	Al-Hikmah University Ilorin, Nigeria