

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_130138
Title of the Manuscript:	On the New Poisson-Exponential-Gamma Distribution
Type of the Article	

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.	This manuscript is merely a comparison of existing discrete distributions, accompanied by an application that shows results approved by other authors. Therefore, it holds no significant importance and can be considered a review article rather than a research article	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No the title is not suitable. I propose this title: "Comparative Analysis of Selected Discrete Distributions with Applications"	
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 of the article is comprehensive and present the general idea of the article	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript does not contain any mathematical calculations; the theoretical section is already covered in other articles. Therefore, we can consider this manuscript scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include a mix of both older and recent sources	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is appropriate for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	<p>I propose conducting a simulation to reinforce the results found</p> <p>The main issue is that the authors do not provide a satisfactory discussion regarding the primary motivation for this paper. Additionally, they fail to highlight the main advantages of the PEG distribution compared to competing models. For instance, how flexible is the proposed distribution in relation to other competitor distributions?</p> <p>Furthermore, the authors do not offer enough information for readers to identify the types of datasets for which the proposed distribution would be applicable, so I propose conducting a simulation to reinforce the results found.</p> <p>There are not ethical issues in this manuscript. There are not competing interest issues in this manuscript There is no plagiarism in this manuscript</p>	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahlem Ghouar
Department, University & Country	Higher School of Management Sciences, Algeria