

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_113089</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>APPLICATION OF LOGISTIC REGRESSION IN MODELING SELF HELP GROUPS' IMPACT ON LIVELIHOODS IN MURANG'A EAST SUB-COUNTY</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1) Yes, particularly, because this study seeks to evaluate how <b>household assets</b>, access to income generating assets, access to loans, access to basic commodities and ability to save affect the <b>wealth status of members</b> of the self-help group (SHG) in Murang'a East sub-county. As it appears, getting engaged in SHG improves the livelihood of SHG members significantly.</p> <p>2) The title is okay, but it would be better off having the title as <b>"Modelling Self Help Groups' Impact on Livelihoods in Murang'a East Sub-County: A Logistic Regression Approach.</b> The existing title emphasize application of logistic regression, not modelling.</p> <p>3) The abstract seems okay.</p> <p>4) Multiple sections/subsections (e.g., 2.1, 2.2, 3.1) are listed as Logistic Regression, which does not look smart. They should be fixed.</p> <p>5) There is some notational inconsistency in the paper. They should be fixed. For example - Equations 2.1 and 3.5 should look similar, equation 2.1 uses <math>z=...</math>, whereas equation 3.5 uses <math>s(x)=...</math>, both should be in identical form. The equation 3.5 is right approach though. - Equation 2.2 uses <math>p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n</math> as predictors, where as in equation 3.3 uses <math>x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n</math> are predictors, which are inconsistent. Use predictors as <math>x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n</math>, rather than <math>p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n</math>. - Equations 3.3 and 3.4 are inconsistent: 3.3 used <math>p</math> as probability, but 3.5 uses <math>\pi_i</math> as probability, should be used in identical notations consistently. - Minor type: Section 2.2, 3<sup>rd</sup> line should use "when it applies to LR" instead of "when it comes to LR" - Table 1 and 2 uses different sets of predictors, why not both sets be modelled together by taking all significant predictor in a single model?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p> <p>The authors should take into accounts all the suggested correction before accepting for publications.</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Khairul Islam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Eastern Michigan University, USA</b>