



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_46556</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exponentiated Pranav Distribution and Its Applications</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This paper is mostly a theoretical discussion on the Parana Distribution.</p> <p>-There's very little information given on mathematical proofs (given by ?)</p> <p>-Where is the data to back up the hypotheses? All the results and data application are summaries of existing known data and it's hard to see any original contribution.</p> <p>-There has been no investigation on the impact of the new demonstration properties.</p> <p>-The list of references highlights that authors use mostly the same reference author. (shanker et al.). Authors should work on this and give a more diversified list of references.</p> <p>The idea of the paper seems to be interesting. However, authors didn't show the practical need and the real novelty of the proposed generalization. All the results and data application are summaries of existing known data and it's hard to see any original contribution</p>	<p>1. The information given for the mathematical proofs in the paper is sufficient enough for brevity.</p> <p>2. This paper does not require hypotheses. The data used in the paper are lifetime datasets used to check the flexibility of the proposed distribution.</p> <p>3. The impact of the proposed distribution has been shown in Table 3.</p> <p>4. On the issue of authors, I believe that has been addressed.</p> <p>5. Finally, the major contribution of this paper is to solve the problem of flexibility in the baseline distribution. This is important because not all lifetime datasets can fit a distribution, hence the need to extend or generalize.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>-There are numerous grammatical errors and overall the paper is hard to read and lacks structure.</p>	<p>These has been duly addressed.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	