



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_38975
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Generalization of Weibull Distribution
Type of the Article	Original research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Grammar, formatting, and typos need to be corrected. Some examples (and there are many more) include (1) second line of Section 1, the first word should be "has", (2) spaces need to be added around where the references are cited in Section 1, and (3) near the bottom of page 1, the sentence "In the following section we will concern with the last one." does not make grammatical sense. - In the first paragraph of Section 2, the equation reference labels do not match those used in the paper. - How do we know that (2.4) and (2.5) are the quantile function and moments of this distribution? There is no proof showing that these are, in fact, the correct formulas. - What is the intent of the numerical study in Section 4? I don't think it is informative regarding this distribution, plus there is no real critical analysis involved. The paper is very scientifically sound, plus it is generally poorly written, which makes it even more difficult to read.	
Minor REVISION comments	Why does the page numbering start at 100? Was this taken from some broader work?	
Optional/General comments	Overall, this paper is hard to follow. There is no justification to the formulas provided and the writing is very deficient.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Derek Young
Department, University & Country	Statistics, University of Kentucky, USA