



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_42546
Title of the Manuscript:	On Lomax-Exponential Distribution: Theory and Applications
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:

(<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	1. A clear motivation for the proposed distribution is missing: which problem of the many already existing competition distributions is solved by this proposal? How to decide whether a simpler distribution is already adequate for a given data set, or whether this more general and more complicated distribution class is needed? 2. In the introduction section is not clearly justified why investigate of interest these results in the statistical literature. Furthermore, author should clearly highlight purposes and motivation of each section. 3. Our main orientation is towards novel contributions to statistical theory. The results should mainly be presented in form of theorems with their mathematical proofs. It is expected that the proofs are not merely routine calculations. Additionally, the discussions of results in their value for the theory or for applications could be a valuable addition, as well as numerical results on the efficiency or examples for the application of the theoretical results. 4. The authors need to concentrate on the quality of English writing. There are several mistakes observed in this article. 5. The description of the estimation procedure is a little bit too brief. It would be good to expand on the algorithm used to estimate the model parameters (are they using a Newton-Raphson algorithm with the exact Hessian matrix?). 6. A simulation study is required to assess the efficiency of the estimators of parameters. The authors need to address this point. 7. In practice, much lifetime data is subject to censoring, but there is no discussion of this. Nor of the extension to regression models. 8. At least a short discussion on the estimation under Bayesian paradigm would be really nice. This would really strengthen the content of the paper. 9. In the application, what is the question of interest, or is it simply an exercise in finding a well-fitting distribution? What do these extended distributions tell us about the data?	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Several equations are numbered and are not cited in the paper. 2. References should be standardized. 3. We also think that the authors should carefully read their paper to eliminate the eventual typos.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelo Bourguignon
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil