



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors discuss step stress accelerated life tests when the samples are Type II and Type I censoring based on Kumaraswamy Weibull distribution. The maximum likelihood estimators of the unknown parameters, the reliability and hazard function are estimated. The log linear model is applied as accelerated model. The confidence intervals for the parameters model are constructed. Optimum test plans are introduced. Such optimum test plans minimize the generalized asymptotic variance of the maximum likelihood estimators of the parameters model. This paper presents a very small contribution to the statistical theory. It looks like as the same as many standard published papers in the field of study. The authors need to do a better job of formulating the problems within some statistical framework and then pursue their answers highlighting the contributions. The presentation needs to improve significantly. The English and the grammar need to be checked and improved in many places. I have some comments: 1. In Abstract, the authors indicate that the hypothesis testis carried out to illustrate the relationship between the stress and the shape parameter, there is no any tests for this purpose in the manuscript. 2. The authors refer to some references not related to the study, for example reference [19] page 20. There are some references in the paper not included in the references list, for example see page 2 line 6 from bottom "Rezk et al. (2013)". 3. Also there are references in the list not included in the manuscript, for example references [2] and [15]. The authors must be updated their references list according to the recent references, for example S. Mitra, A. Ganguly, D. Samanta, D.	• The paper applied accelerated life test on a new distribution which is KumW distribution. • The English and the Grammar were checked. • It was illustrated in page 13. • We omitted it. • The reference was added in the references list.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Kundu ."On the simple step-stress model for two-parameter exponential distribution", <i>Statistical Methodology, Volume 15, November 2013, Pages 95-114</i> 4. The authors used sample sizes 100, 200, ...,500 in simulation studies, what about small sample size which is more important to study? 5. Page 8 line 3 from bottom equations (37) – (39) where these equations in the paper? 6. There are many abbreviations not defined, for example GAV page 8 7. There are many mistakes in the English language and the grammar formatting, for example page 9 8. The suggested values of the unknown parameters not enough for the simulation study. 9. The authors indicate that type I censored is the same as type ii censored "likelihood function" this is not correct, see page 13 Section 4.1 10. Page 20 line 2 from bottom (20) is not correct, please check. 11. The conclusion remarks are not sufficient. My recommendation is revised the paper and resubmitted again.	• The references were updated and the mentioned paper was added in the references list • Results were found for n=20, 30, 60 and 100 and the results were put in new tables. • These equations exit in the appendix. • It was defined. • The English language and the grammar formatting were reviewed. • The suggested values are just to illustrate the idea. • It was considered. • It was corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		