

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_85735
Title of the Manuscript:	Logistic regression without intercept
Type of the Article	Commentary

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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract is not conclusion. So rewrite abstract. 2. VIF mentioned in keywords does not reflect practically anywhere in the entire work. 3. What do you mean by monotonic transformation of independent variables in logistic regression model with and without intercept? There is no monotonic transformation of independent variables in logistic regression model without intercept in your work as you mentioned in abstract and conclusion. If you have nothing to show about the transformation, I think you remove it from the work. 4. Parameters in equation (2.1) are not explain, do so. 5. The statement “the log likelihood of logistic regression is defined by equation (2.3)” is referring to which logistic regression function?. If you are referring to equation (2.2), check equation (2.3) again. 6. Differentiating equation (2.3) w.r.t β and $l'(\beta) = 0$ does not give equation (2.4). Only the first term of equation (2.2) when differentiating gives (2.4) as $\frac{e^{X_1\beta}}{(1+e^{X_1\beta})^2}$ not $\frac{e^{X_1\beta}}{(1+e^{X_1\beta})}$ as you shown in the text. What about the second term of (2.2)? 7. Check equation (2.6), how does it differ from equation (2.4)? 8. In equation (3.1), if $\alpha_0=0$ what will happen to that equation? I suggest the summation sign should cover from the first term ($i = 0, 1, \dots, p$) in order not to affect the equation when any constant is zero based on your definition of multicollinearity. But if you consider (3.1) as a system without intercept, then remove the first term. 9. In model 4 from the result, intercept B_0 tends to zero does not mean it is zero. This shouldn't be a comparative reason to conclude that model 4 with intercept and model 5 without the intercept are the same. 10. Example 6.4 does not have any evident to prove the existence of multicollinearity of the model with intercept. This claim can be shown by using the value of VIF. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Warning message under example 6.5 is not necessary, I suggest you remove it. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Akra, Ukeme Paulinus
Department, University & Country	University of Calabar, Nigeria