



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_54245
Title of the Manuscript:	MEDICAL CHOICES FOR A WEALTHY NATION - A MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC MODEL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	1. Abstract should be structured 2. References should be cited in chronological order and the reference list should be arranged accordingly 3. Author name should be mentioned first followed by reference number in the end throughout the text (the reference number is given instead) 4. Ethical Approval required	I do not agree with Reviewer's comments (1), (3) and (4). For comment (1), a good Abstract contains research problem, scope of the study, research methodology, results discussion and brief recommendation. All these requirements are clearly seen in the Abstract so contained in our manuscript. For Comment 3, the usual method is to cite an author's paper using the reference number of the properly referenced literature. This approach has been adopted in conjunction with corrections for comment 2. For Comment 4, the data used for this research is primary and therefore do not require Ethical approval.
Minor REVISION comments	1. In research methodology clearly mention that null hypothesis is tested 2. Preferably use latest references during past 5 year 3. Results and discussion should be under separate headings	We are interested in estimating the likelihood that an individual with a given level of education would select a particular medical treatment option and not testing if level of education affects people's medical treatment options. We therefore do not require to state the hypothesis having stated the Multinomial Logistics Regression Model. We have included a literature published in the year 2017. Result and discussion was stated under section 3.0.
Optional/General comments	It's interesting work which will find its utility in the pattern of behaviour towards diseases with literacy	

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