



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	- The manuscript uses sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses and the references are adequate. So, it is accepted for publication but, should be <u>improved</u> prior to publication by addressing the following comments: - The language used to write the paper is not good and needs correcting of English mistakes, for example - The sentence in page 4, beginning with "The sample" is not correct. - Write "till" instead of "til" in page 5. - Delete "Determinant" before GAV in page 8. - Use "Secondly, the mean ..." instead of "The Secondly, is" and also for Thirdly, in page 9. - Add "are" before "used in this simulation...)" in page 14. - Write "rejected" instead of "reject" in page 12. - The paper needs to contain Acronyms and Notations. - The manuscript applied accelerated life test (ALT) on a new distribution, which was not used before for analyzing ALT, without studying its properties	- All comments were corrected. - Do you mean to put all the Acronyms and Notations after the abstract instead of defining every notation and abbreviation inside the paper? - The properties of the KumW distribution are discussed in Cordeiro <i>et al.</i> (2010) and Rezk <i>et al.</i> (2013).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and whether it is suitable or not. • The authors should not compare between failure and time censoring, when they first introduced the first in page 5. • The symbol "N" should be used to represent the whole sample size, not the population in page 8. • The authors used "r_j" as a proportion of units fail in stage j, in page 8, while they assumed that "n_j" units fail in this stage in page 5. • The term "true parameter values" is used, which is wrong. It is better to use "initial parameter values" instead. • It is better to use "variance covariance matrix" in the Title of Table 2. It is preferable then to add a column contains a, b, β for each sample size. • The value of α should =0.05 or 0.01 not 0.5 in page 12. • In Table 8, the values of "t_0" should be the same for both the reliability and hazard functions. • The authors do not explain "as follows:" in page 13. • In the Simulation algorithm in page 14, the same assumptions of the case of failure censoring should not be repeated, only refer to them. • There are no equations after (28), so equation (37) should be (29). • Equations (41) and (43) are too long, so they should be divided into parts.	• "n_j" is used as a general notation and for Type I censoring but "r_j" is used in Type II censoring . • Indeed the asymptotic variance covariance matrix was calculated but we found that it didn't add more information so we omitted it. • The column was added. • It was corrected. • It was considered. • It was omitted. • It was considered. • It was corrected. • The Equations were divided into parts.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		