



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		
Minor REVISION comments	Page 3, $\varepsilon = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ should be added to equation (3.1). Page 3, rewrite equation (3.2) as $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon f(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{p}$ to match with equation (3.1). Page 4, C_{n-1} is undefined in equations (3.12) and (3.13). Page 5, check the assignments below Figure 1. It should be; $a_1 = 0.7, a_1 = 0.8, a_1 = 0.9, a_1 = 1$ not a_p. Page 6, check the assignments below Figure 2. It should be; $a_1 = 0.7, a_1 = 0.8, a_1 = 0.9, a_1 = 1$ not a_p. Page 7, check the assignments below Figure 3. It should be; $a_1 = 0.7, a_1 = 0.8, a_1 = 0.9, a_1 = 1$ not a_p.	Page 3, "$\hspace*{10mm} \xi = 1, 2, 3, \dots$" was added to equation (3.1). Page 3, equation (3.2) was rewritten as "$\sum_{\xi=1}^{\infty} \xi f(\xi) = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}}$". Page 4, The following sentences were added: "$\{_{j-1}C_{n-1}\}$ is defined as $\{_{j-1}C_{n-1}\} = \frac{(j-1)!}{(j-n)!(n-1)!}$ (${}^{\sim}$ represent a factorial.)". In the caption of Figure 1, "a_0"s were replaced with "a_0"s. In the caption of Figure 2, "a_0"s were replaced with "a_0"s. In the caption of Figure 3, "a_0"s were replaced with "a_0"s.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 8, indicate $\tilde{p} = 0.6$ and $\tilde{p} = 0.7$ on the bottom-left and bottom-right graphs respectively in Figure 4. Page 9, line 20 should read: “In contrast, the mean of the unbiased estimator is 0.5114333, and”	In Figure 4, The top-left graph shows the distribution of $\{\hat{p}\}$ given by the predictive estimator when $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.4$ is set. The bottom-left graph shows the distribution of $\{p^+\}$ given by the maximum likelihood estimator when $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.4$ is set. On the other hand, the top-right graph shows the distribution of $\{\hat{p}\}$ given by the predictive estimator when $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.5$ is set. The bottom-right graph shows the distribution of $\{p^+\}$ given by the maximum likelihood estimator when $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.5$ is set. Hence, Figure 4 does not include the graphs for the setting of $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.6$ and $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.7$ On page 9, line 20, “predictive estimator” was replaced with “maximum likelihood estimator” because the bottom-right graph shows the result given by the maximum likelihood estimator when $\{\tilde{p}\} = 0.5$ is set.
Optional/General comments	I expected equation (3.25) to be $r_{error}(P^+, \tilde{p}) = \frac{d(\tilde{p})}{d(p^+)}$	I do not think that this replacement is needed because this value is less than 1 when the predictive estimator is better than the maximum likelihood estimator as the right graph of Figure 5 shows.