

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Basic and Applied Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBARI_12777
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Performance of Zero-Truncated Count Distributions in Modelling Brent Crude Oil Price in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript assesses two count distributions on the prices of Brent Crude Oil in Nigeria using secondary data obtained from the country's Central Bank. Using different selection criteria, the study found the ZTPP more reliable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the Abstract Section, the authors are advised to state in full the ZTPP and GZTP where they were first used. It is also essential to state the period the data covered as both the mean price and the associated standard deviation presented are presumed to be different from current realities.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Many claims in the manuscript are not correct. Attempts by the authors to identify research gap seems unacceptable. There are no evidence that the identified gaps really exist in similar researchers. Instead, the authors are advised to mainly focus on the advantages of their propositions instead of making effort to fill a non-existing gap.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In most cases, examples given in the Introduction section are not count/discrete variables when the distributions of interest in the study are majorly discrete. This should be carefully looked into. The distributions being assessed are for count data. How does the price of Crude Oil falls into being count?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors are advised to only state claim that can be generally acceptable to be truth. Instead of claiming that the considered distributions in the study is 'filling research gap', the authors can present them as alternatives to the existing ones.	

Review Form 3

=	The authors are to state the justification for the simulation studies, especially when the assessed distributions were not proposed by them.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, except few typographical and space error. The authors are advised to carefully glance through the manuscript for few of this.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adetunji, A. A.
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria