



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29941
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical Method for Obtaining a Predictive Estimator for the Geometric Distribution
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. Authors need to give some practical examples to explain their method. 2. Authors also need to explain the motive of the geometric distribution clearly. 3. Authors also need to compare their method with other methods. 4. In practical application, Authors also need to consider the censored sample for Predictive Estimator .	1. In "Conclusions", the following sentences were added: "Construction of the predictive estimator for the geometric distribution is also of practical value. For example, estimation of the parameter of the geometric distribution plays a critical role in evaluation of system failure rate." 2. In "Conclusions", the following sentence was added: "We obtain more useful estimates of the parameter of the geometric distribution using the predictive estimator" 3. In "Conclusions", the following sentences were added: "because the predictive estimator developed here provides a better fit to future data than the maximum likelihood estimator in many circumstances; we are typically more interested in the system in the future than that in the past." 4. In "Conclusions", the following sentences were added: "However, the parameter estimation of the geometric distribution uses truncated data in most of practical situations because of limited observation time. Hence, we should develop the idea of the predictive estimator toward more flexible ones to treat various situations. The simplicity of the algorithm suggested here implies that it is not very difficult to extend this method for more general problems."
Minor REVISION comments	1. In the notations, the English style and the clarity of exposition need to improve, for example : (i)page 4	(i) In (3.6), "$(j=1,2,\ldots, G)$" was replaced with "$(k=1,2,\ldots, G)$".



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(3.6) and (3.7) need to explain them clearly; (ii)page 5 (3.15), (3.16) and (3.17) need to explain them clearly, etc.. 2. I suggest that authors also need a good proof-reading by a writer.	In the sentence just before (3.7), Eq.(2.3) was replaced with Eq.(3.3). (ii) Just after (3.15), (3.16) and (3.17), the following sentences were added: "The forms of the equations above are not based on deep insight into predictive estimators. They are mere attempts to derive a predictive estimator by simple algorithm. However, if such rudimentary derivation of a predictive estimator is successful, it implies that numerical methods are promising tools to obtain more useful estimators than the maximum likelihood estimator". Other parts were improved by reference to the comments by other reviewers. 2. This manuscript was proofread by a professional proofread service.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No.	