



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_41012
Title of the Manuscript:	Mathematical Programming for Statistical Inference
Type of the Article	Method 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper presents interesting examples of the application of mathematical programming to hypotheses testing. The contents may be useful for people who use statistical hypotheses testing for practical purposes. However, the article is not written properly. The presentation is sloppy, to say the least. Almost each sentence contains grammar mistakes to say nothing about punctuation. Here are some examples, only to mention a few. 1) "Two model" must be changed to "two models". 2) "level of significant" has to be replaced by the "level of significance" 3) "confident in rejecting the null" has to be "... the null hypothesis". 4) "K which maxims" has to be "K which maximizes" 5) "The study interested to calculate" has to be "the study aims to calculate" This list can be easily extended, but I do not think that such a proof reading is a referee's duty. Apart from that, the Introduction part has to be more informative. Currently, it consists of a few well-known facts from the undergraduate statistics course. This has to be shortened and some relevant overview of the subject has to be presented. In my opini0on, the work needs serious revision.	1- The reason for the study write by different way as: The study is concerned with the transforming theoretical Mathematical models in to applied Mathematical programming models that are easily to handle and use. These Mathematical programming models can be applied and used in statistical inference, which used in many applied fields, for example, quality control and its application 2- two mathematical programming models, 3- different level of significance, 4- null hypothesis 5- critical value (K) which maximizes 6- This section shows the two theoretical Mathematical models which transformed in to applied Mathematical programming models the revision 7- First: Arthanari and Dodge [2] equivalent the previous theoretical mathematical programming for Neyman-Pearson problem when simple H_0 against simple H_1 with finite sample space. The first suggested model converts equivalent theoretical mathematical model for Arthanari and Dodge [2] to mathematical programming model as follows: 8- : The second suggested model depends on the first suggested mathematical programming model when binomial distribution is used as probability distribution as follows: 9- The study will measure the performance for the two suggested mathematical programming models for hypotheses tests in the following section. 10- The study was able to convert theoretical Mathematical models in to applied Mathematical programming models that are could be used easily. This paper proposed two suggested mathematical programming models to determinate power of a statistical test and the critical value (K). 11- The study measured the performance for the two suggested mathematical programming models with different sample sizes and different level of significance. The results were as follows: 12- The study was able to convert theoretical Mathematical models in to applied Mathematical programming models that are could be used easily. This paper proposed two suggested mathematical programming models to determinate power of a statistical test and the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		critical value (K). 13- The study measured the performance for the two suggested mathematical programming models with different sample sizes and different level of significance. The results were as follows: There are some modification or review for some sentences. Please see the paper.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		