



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 (<i>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</i>)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The manuscript should be written in understandable English language. There are statements and paragraphs that are very hard to under-stand. For example, P. 1 (line 8b), P.5 (line 10a), P.7 (line 8a) and paragraphs: bottom of P.2 and top of P.3, 2. Substantial reduction is possible and is a must. 3. Only large values are considered. What is the gain in considering such large values as N=500 under ALT and censoring? 4. What might be a single practical use for the proposed model?. 5. The 15 tables must be reduced and the use of some of their presentation should be explained. 6. The population distribution depends on 4 parameters. Only one is assumed unknown. Is this practical?. What if all parameters are unknown? Isn't this what should practically happen?	• All were considered. • We tried to do. • Results were found for n=20, 30, 60 and 100 and the results were put in new tables. • It can be applied for life testing experiments. • We tried to reduce the tables. • Indeed we have five parameters and only two were considered unknown, maybe it's practical in some fields.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript should be better organized. For example, the special cases on P. 17 should be moved to P. 2 (after the main model). No need to spell out the distribution forms. It would be sufficient to point out to the parameter value which leads to the particular special case (to just mention the name),	• It was considered.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some abbreviations are not defined. Misprints and linguistic errors should be corrected.	• All abbreviations were defined and errors were corrected.