



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7560
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical Inference for a Simple Step Stress Model Based on Censored Data from The Kumaraswamy Weibull Distribution
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In this paper discussed step stress tests and use MLE to obtain the unknown parameters. The reliability and hazard function are estimated and other results therefore the idea of this paper is very nice. But there are something, I believe it's important 1-equation 22 not clear, why the linear between a2 and b2 estimators 2- review the fisher matrix in appendix 3- in simulation algorithm. How generated data from Kum W distribution, not clear Must be relation between this distribution and uniform distribution 4-the table for step stress 1 and 2 there are a little deferent data without any comment 5- The result may be need comment 6- There are some linguistic mistakes In general the paper is accepted to publish in your journal after make the previous observation.	• In many studies concerning accelerated life testing (ALT), the log linear function between life and stress which is just a simple re-parameterization of the distribution is used to obtain the estimates of the original parameters. Also it was assumed that a & b are unknown depending on the nature of the product type and the test method. • We have reviewed it. • It was illustrated in page 8. • The comment was added. • Some details for the comment were added. • It was corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		