

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123452
Title of the Manuscript:	How to Choose the Right Regression Model for Your Data
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript highlights the importance of selecting the appropriate regression model in data analysis, emphasizing its impact on accuracy and interpretability. It provides a comprehensive overview of various regression types and discusses model assumptions, overfitting, and underfitting, stressing the need for a balance between complexity and interpretability. Overall, it serves as a valuable resource for both novice and experienced researchers in the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "How to Choose the Right Regression Model for Your Data" is suitable for this manuscript as it accurately reflects the main focus and objectives of the study.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could be improved by adding specific examples of when to use each regression type, discussing the practical implications of model selection on research outcomes, and highlighting the importance of data preprocessing. These additions would enhance clarity and provide a more holistic view of the model selection process</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's subsections and structure are well-organized, effectively facilitating understanding of the content. It features a logical flow, starting with the significance of model selection, followed by detailed discussions of various regression types, ensuring comprehensive coverage of key concepts, assumptions, and applications.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, thoroughly exploring regression model selection and its impact on prediction accuracy. It discusses the importance of aligning model assumptions with data characteristics and addresses common issues like overfitting, providing practical guidance. Overall, its detailed examination of various regression types and their applications offers a solid foundation for researchers.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are primarily older studies, many from the 1990s and early 2000s, which may limit their relevance to current research contexts. To improve the review, more recent references from the last five years that focus on advancements in statistical methods, particularly in relation to malaria research and epidemiology, should be included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are instances of inconsistent formatting.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally good for publication.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ebenezer Tawiah Arhin
Department, University & Country	Tamale Technical University, Ghana