

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_118753
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved LARS algorithm for adaptive LASSO in the linear regression model
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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. The manuscript presents an improved GLARS algorithm combining adaptive LASSO with biased estimators. It demonstrates good performance in high-dimensional models with multicollinearity. The method outperforms existing adaptive LASSO and Elastic Net algorithms.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes. But you may further stress the advantages of your algorithm (or does it only satisfy "effectiveness"?).</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>If there is a chance of revision, you may de-italicize text in formulas and equations. For example, "LARSO" "Enet" "new" etc. are text, not mathematical symbols, so they should not be italicized.</p> <p>Perhaps operators such as "Cor" should also not be italicized.</p> <p>Bolded matrices and vectors are also better not be italicized.</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Chaoqian Wang
Department, University & Country	George Mason University, USA