

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_84366
Title of the Manuscript:	Inverted Power Ishita Distribution and Its Application to Lifetime Data
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	<p style="text-align: center;">Title: Inverted Power Ishita Distribution and Its Application to Lifetime Data</p> <p>In this paper, a new distribution, named 'the Inverted Power Ishita distribution', was introduced. It is an extension of the Ishita distribution and its capable of modelling real life data with upside down bathtub shape and heavy tails was introduced. Mathematical and statistical characteristics such as the quantile function, mode, moments and moment generating function, entropy measure, stochastic ordering and distribution of order statistics have been derived. Furthermore, reliability measures like survival function, hazard function and odds function have been derived. The method of maximum likelihood was used for estimating the parameters of the distribution. To demonstrate the applicability of the distribution, a numerical example was given.</p> <p>In my opinion,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can you say that this distribution is a better performer in comparison to other lifetime failure models? Justify. 2. The literature section is not enough; add some latest papers. 3. The motivation and novelty of the paper should be defined clearly in the introductory section. 4. The author uses PDF and pdf both for probability density function. This is confusing. 5. Just after equation (27), "Taking natural log of 27...", improve this sentence. 6. The sentence, just after equation (4) is confusing, check. 7. There are many estimation methods, why the author uses this particular method, justify. 8. Section 6, is conclusion, not conclusions. 9. What is real life use of this paper, explain. 10. Which software is used here for computational purposes? 11. The author should check the paper thoroughly because there are so many grammatical errors. <p>Additionally, I have not found any major problem in this paper, but a revision is needed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Intekhab Alam
Department, University & Country	St, Andrews Institute of Technology and Management, India