



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_42521</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Improved Estimator of Finite Population Variance using Coefficient of Quartile Deviation</b>
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your article is based upon merely 9 references; Does it mean that people are not interested in the work you are doing? Actually references establish that the topic you are working upon is an alive topic in the literature.</li> <li>2. You could cite only a single reference from 2018; Does it mean that the problem has been solved?</li> <li>3. Where such estimators are usually used? Why you need to develop more efficient estimators?</li> <li>4. More rigorous literature review is required to base your study on. Especially when you are using an age old Isaki (1983) estimator. You need to develop a critique on different versions of the estimators present in the past with the intention to establish the need and superiority of yours' work. Why different versions are needed for the Isaki (1983) estimator; What are the plus points for these versions? What are the down side of these estimators? What is the need of developing another version?</li> <li>5. Although N and Y are well understood in the statistical literature. Still, it is better to define the symbiology used in your paper (First line of your paper).</li> <li>6. What do you mean by "precision of the best results". Perhaps you want to write "precision of the results".</li> <li>7. What is the rational of using Coefficient of Quartile Devistion instead of variance? Just for fun? Just for curiosity? Or it has some theoretical base? You need to rationalize the switching. You need to establish why only Coefficient of Quartile deviation works well.</li> <li>8. Quartiles are more famous for their role in developing robust versions. Does your study leading towards robustness?</li> <li>9. What is the rationale of using age old data sets, like Murthy (1967) or Sing &amp; Chaudhary (1986)? Why only these data sets?</li> <li>10. What is the significance of your study? Who may be benefitted from this? It is simply another estimator or it does have some characteristics which attracts people to use it.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We think that 9 references are enough. It doesn't mean that people dislike this type of work.</li> <li>2. According to literature, different data requires different solution. However, in our work, proposed estimator is performing better from reviewed ones. Hence, we can say that proposed estimator is better than existing ones.</li> <li>3. These estimators mostly used in agriculture. We need these efficient estimators for the estimation of population parameters.</li> <li>4. According to literature, different data requires different solution. However, in our work, proposed estimator is performing better from reviewed ones. Different real data sets require improvement in the version of Isaki (1983).</li> <li>5. It looks well written. We don't think that there is a need of any chngement.</li> <li>6. We remove "best" according the referee suggestion.</li> <li>7. Utilization of Quartile Deviation will minimize the constant Ks' and hence MSE.</li> <li>8. It is not robust but helpful for the efficient estimation.</li> <li>9. Because these are the most famous data sets available in literature.</li> <li>10. The main attraction of the proposed estimator is that it always provides better results from the reviewed ones.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citations and References must satisfy some known referencing style, like APA, Harvard, etc.</li> <li>2. I would like to see the data, in actual, with its results as calculated from some known statistical package, like SPSS, R, SAS, etc.</li> <li>3. Some graphical work may increase the understanding of the results.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We follow over university pattern for references.</li> <li>2. Sorry, but we already give the required characteristics of the data in table 3. Please see.</li> <li>3. All the 9 papers we studied, never contain any graphical work, so we think there is no need.</li> </ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NA	