

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_129877
Title of the Manuscript:	A SINE-ISHITA DISTRIBUTION: PROPERTIES AND APPLICATIONS TO SURVIVAL DATA.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author(s) introduced a novel extension of the Ishita distribution using the Sine G family of distributions. They derived several properties of the new distribution and estimated the parameter of the distribution using the maximum likelihood estimation method. Applications to four real life datasets demonstrated the superior performance of the proposed model as compared to other established models. This marks a significant contribution to the field of Probability theory.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive	ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The following recent literature should be added: a. Sule, O. B., Kayid, M., Sayed, R. M., Balogun, O. S., Hammad, A. T., and Abd El-Raouf, M. M. (2025). Transmuted inverse unit Teissier distribution: Properties, estimations and applications to medical and radiation sciences. <i>Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences</i> , 18(1), 101208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrras.2024.101208 b. Halid O. Y. and Sule O. B. (2022). A Classical and Bayesian estimation techniques for Gompertz Inverse Rayleigh Distribution: Properties and Applications. <i>Pakistan Journal of Statistics</i> . 38(1): 49 – 76. c. Sapkota, L. P., Alsahangiti, A. M., Kumar, V., Gemeay, A. M., Bakr, M. E., Balogun, O. S., and	Added

Review Form 3

	Muse, A. H. (2023). Arc-Tangent Exponential Distribution with Applications to Weather and Chemical Data Under Classical and Bayesian Approach. <i>IEEE Access</i> , 11, 115462-115476. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3324293	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>Overall, the manuscript is well-written and presents a valuable contribution to the field of probability theory. However, the following comments should be addressed before recommending it for publication:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript does not present any motivation for the study. The authors should include the motivation. 2. In the description of the paper's structure, the author(s) stated: "The estimation of parameters using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) and simulation study is presented in section 4." However, I noticed that no simulation study was conducted in the manuscript. I recommend removing the reference to the simulation study. Additionally, since the model is a one-parameter model, it should be "parameter," not "parameters." 3. There is inconsistency in the use of abbreviations for PDF and CDF throughout the manuscript. In some instances, they are presented in capital letters, while in others, they appear in lowercase or italics. I recommend standardizing the formatting of these abbreviations to ensure consistency throughout the paper. 4. In the interpretation of the PDF plot of the proposed model, the authors state: "From the figure above, it can be seen that the PDF SISD is positively skewed and takes various shapes depending on the parameter values." I suggest referencing the figure as "Figure 1" and revising the sentence for grammatical correctness to: "From Figure 1, it can be seen that the PDF of the SISD is positively skewed and takes various shapes depending on the parameter values." 5. There is a lack of consistency in the referencing style; some references use '&' while others use 'and.' I recommend ensuring uniformity throughout the manuscript. <p>There is no competing interest</p>	<p>Effectuated revision</p> <p>Noted and done</p> <p>Revised</p>

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