

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_118753</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Improved LARS algorithm for adaptive LASSO in the linear regression model</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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. <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>This manuscript is important to the scientific community because it is an extension of the existing LASSO regression algorithm and it shows great numerical efficiency based on error metric.</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>The abstract is succinct and concise</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are fine</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The authors need to add more recent references from 2020-2024.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the English is great</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Authors used only the Root Mean Square Error as the metric of comparison for the improved algorithm against existing algorithm. It is recommended that they use absolute error, mean square error as well. It is recommended that the authors state that the computational efficiency of the improved algorithm was not tested based on running time of the algorithm which is an empirical analytical method. Authors also should state that they did not check computational efficiency in terms of space.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Gbenga Aduagbemi Adegbite
Department, University & Country	Covenant University, Nigeria