



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_41267
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISING OF GOODNESS OF FIT TESTS FOR NORMAL DISTRIBUTION.
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper presented very study on COMPARISING OF GOODNESS OF FIT TESTS FOR NORMAL DISTRIBUTION.. In his form the paper can't be accepted to be published in the journal. 1. There are many irregularities in English in this paper, so it should be revised seriously. 2. There is no significant in the present paper. 3. Discussion part is too weak, 4. Conclusions must be comprehensive and not written like a report. 5. Figures are not of high quality to be published. 6. It's very important if you added some references of 2016-2017.	I have gone through the paper and correct the use of English(I will be glad if any error sentence is italicized and bold for easy identification). Significance of the study is included now. The discussion part have been briefly improved upon, I will be glad if you suggest how it should look like. Conclusion improved briefly. What is the challenge with the figure? Clarify. References have been added Thanks for your comments am grateful.