Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Mathematics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJOM_85010**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Estimation of Finite Population Mean Using An Improved Class of Mixed Estimators with Two Auxiliary Variables**
Type of the 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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Reviewer's comment</th><th>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)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Compulsory REVISION comments</td><td>

Minimum variance bound should write in keywords as (MBV).
In the manuscript the symbols like coefficient of variation, simple correlation, partial or multiple correlation, w, $\bar{x}^*$, $\bar{z}^*$, g, θ, etc. not defined anywhere. All the symbols used in the manuscript should define in the manuscript. Authors can define them in a new section "Notation"
Equation 34 is not written clearly. Here authors should use comma between two statements of should shown by two different equations.
Some of the citations are not included in References section. (ex. Singh (1967), page 3, line 22),
Section 4.2 Bivariate Dual to Product Estimator. It is Bivariate or Trivariate….authors should clarify.
Table 4 should shown horizontally instead of vertically.
All the estimators discussed by authors, should be used for comparison purpose in the numerical study.
Table 5 could be modified as
<table>
<tr><td>Population No.</td><td colspan="2">t1</td><td colspan="2">t2</td><td colspan="2">t3</td><td colspan="2">t4</td><td>…….</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>bias</td><td>mse</td><td>bias</td><td>mse</td><td>bias</td><td>mse</td><td>biae</td><td>mse</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
References are not written properly. It should write carefully. Authors should cite at least 5 recent references in the manuscript.
Section 5.1, 5.2 etc. should change as (a), (b) etc.

</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Minor REVISION comments</td><td>The years in the references authors write (1967a), (2003b) etc. it could rewrite as 1967, 2003 as there is not similar repetition. Grammatical errors are also try to reduce as possible in the manuscript.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Optional/General comments</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Review Form 1.6

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:	**Narendra Singh Thakur**
Department, University & Country	**Govt. Adarsh Girls College, India**