

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJPAS_117707
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW OF SOME GOODNESS-OF-FIT TEST FOR LOGISTIC 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>Compulsory 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>Yes. The study gives a clear guidance on how to use the different goodness of fit test measures. It helps other researchers or practitioners to identify which test is use for model comparison and for testing accuracy.</p> <p>Yes. The title is straightforward, and the content is aligned to it, which is a review of the different goodness of fit test.</p> <p>It's comprehensive but just be consistent with the name of the test to avoid confusion to the readers. Example Hosmer-Lemeshow Test instead of Hosmo-Lemeshow test.</p> <p>Consider converting the scientific value format to decimal format for ease of reading and comparison.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Consider validating typo errors. Content is good but it could have been better if applied to different industries so we can have a benchmark of what is the robust test applicable to all kinds of industries.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	NA	

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:	Sandrilito V Abogada Jr
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Philippines