

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_84229
Title of the Manuscript:	Probability Theory
Type of the Article	Commentary

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I do believe that this study advances the field of commentary because it outlined clearly the areas of application of probability theory and its importance, but there are a few points that need further clarifications to the reader's benefits. Below are the points.2. The purpose of the study should be explicitly stated in the abstract.3. The conclusion is unclear please rewrite the conclusion	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There is the need to check for some grammatical errors for example, under section 3 line 3 of page 3, paragraph 4 on page 5.2. If necessary, I humbly recommend that some literature to be included under section 3.3. There are few issues of typographical errors that must be checked.	
Optional/General comments	I would like to start by giving the author(s) complements for their thorough job with this manuscript. I think this is an exemplary piece of work. Next to the fact that the replication is well thought-out and planned according to the necessary steps and that I agree that there is replication value. The manuscript showed clearly where probability theory is applied and the importance of probability theory. In summary, I recommend this manuscript be accepted.	

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:	Nagulama Moses
Department, University & Country	Busitema University, Uganda