



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_19002
Title of the Manuscript:	A Simulation Analysis of Distortion Operators Of Wang, NIG And Cauchy: A Comparative Approach.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There is some chaos in alternating upper-case and lower-case letters in the title of the manuscript. The first chapter of the article has no title and number (something like the title is there, but it has a completely different form than other chapter headings). Some formulas are at the left edge, some formulas are in the middle of page. No formulas are basically numbered and when are numbered, it is made by very non-standard way, when the number formulas appear without any brackets next to the formula. Until in the last part of the manuscript formula numbers are in parentheses to the right of the formula as it should be. Article is very unfinished at first glance. The manuscript is unpublishable in its current form.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Table titles have not the same form, Table 5 even lies on two pages and its title is under the table, while titles of all other tables are above tables. Forms of titles of Tables 7 and 8 are completely different of previous tables. The title of the graphs is not on the page, where graphs are. The paper has only a very brief summary, and has absolutely no conclusion. I recommend to broaden summary and to supplement the conclusions. Each table has a different set margins.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend to give giving the reference numbers in square brackets.	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Diana Bílková
Department, University & Country	Department of Statistics and Probability, University of Economics, Prague, Czech Republic