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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | * In the manuscript, wherever they appear, Weibull and Lindley must begin with capital letter. * Wherever it appears **it’s** should be removed and the statement should be reconstructed. * Yahaya *et al.* (13) as stated in the last line of the first page does not appear in the reference section * In the Section 2.1 “cdf of continuous PLinD (reference)”. The necessary reference must be stated. * In the Figure 4, the authors are encouraged to ensure that the graphs of the hazard function are elongated to reveal where the lines terminate * In the Section 2.4, the authors are encouraged to state the statistical package along with the library used for this manuscript. * The authors should state the justification for the use of the selected parameter values and sample sizes for the simulation studies * Section 3.2 should be completely overhauled. The section begins with “**This part of chapter four**” * From Table 4, the authors must show consistency in the number of decimal places. * From Table 6, the BIC of PLind is lesser than that of ExPLind and this was not discussed. * Using a single dataset to justify the superiority of the new proposition is not enough. * The authors are encouraged to use another dataset to verify this. | Noted and corrected.  * All “it’s” removed and corrected appropriately. * Reference taken care of. * Reference provided. * Figure four elongated. * Statistical package and library provided. * Justification provided. * Section 3.2 taken care of. * Decimal places adjusted. * Comment on BIC noted and taken care of. * A second set of data in a different field was used to fit the ExPLinD and other compared distribution, it outperformed as well but it is not presented here. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Some quoted reference in the body of the work are not found in the reference section. | Noted and corrected. |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, except few typographical and space error. The authors are advised to carefully glance through the manuscript for few of this. | Noted and corrected accordingly. |
| Optional/General comments |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the 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?** |  |  |