



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_46795
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARING ZEROINFLATED POISSON, ZERO-INFLATED NEGATIVE BINOMIAL AND ZERO-INFLATED GEOMETRIC IN COUNT DATA WITH EXCESS ZERO
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This was found in the abstract "The Poisson distribution is sometimes suggested but when the assumption of equal mean and variance is violated due to over-dispersion we tend to look in the direction of other models. Zero-inflated data falls in this category". The statement is not absolutely correct because over-dispersion is not the only reason for not adopting Poisson regression, also under-dispersion. The reason for using zero Inflated models is not necessarily because of dispersion type but also because of presence of zero.</p> <p>-Generalized Linear model/ Exponential class of family, link functions and regression models for fitting count data should be sufficiently discussed.</p> <p>- The distribution from where simulation was made was not clearly stated, and the parameters used for the simulation should be clearly stated for readers.</p> <p>-The type of dispersion simulated per time should be made known, is it over-dispersion with zero counts or under-dispersion with zero counts?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>- The authors(s) should use equation editor for all mathematical equations and symbols irrespective of how small it is, and not directly from the key board.</p> <p>-Font types are not the same, this should be looked into.</p> <p>-Sufficient literatures were not reviewed.</p> <p>-Analytical software used for the analysis was not mentioned</p> <p>-Real-life data can be used to validate the result obtained from simulation study and add more value to the work. Real-life count data (though difficult to get) can be found in R "COUNT package". The author(s) may consider downloading useful data uploaded by Adesina et. al (2018). Bayesian Dirichet Process Mixture Prior for Count Data, by visiting O.S Adesina page on "research gate".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary and Conclusion was too small, this can be improved upon by relating or comparing the results obtained to previous work. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study was well conceived, as it aimed to contribute to the existing body of literature. However, a lot of work has been carried out in this area; therefore, the author(s) should state their objectives clearly.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olumide Adesina
Department, University & Country	Olabisi Onabanjo Univesity, Nigeria