



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_53589</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Multicollinearity Effect in Regression Analysis: A Feed Forward Artificial Neural Network Approach</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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:

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



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There are some doubts to what extent the use of the neural network model could be beneficial in identifying determinants of phenomena, whether biological or otherwise. It is essentially an algorithm that reports successive, broad, complex computations supposedly sensible.</p> <p>The key issue in these number manipulation methods is the suspect that the conclusions could be wrong, the errors can occur simply due to chance or due to other factors (poorly prevented confusion).</p> <p>A frequent cause of these unfortunate conclusions is the poor quality of the data used, a matter on which this article does not tell us say. For example, the independent variables were of what type (quantitative, categorical)? Was it subjected to previous treatment like the method requires? And what kind of treatment was performed? Has it been substantially changed? How did authors deal with missing fields? This question of data quality assumes greater relevance because some of the variables are difficult to understand (e.g. what values are in the "miscellaneous" field?</p> <p>Therefore, in causality studies, "best fitting" is not all or automatically validates any procedure, it is expected that the confrontation with the reality of the facts shows that the results make sense, which are plausible. The truth is that reading the article does not removes any of these questions from the reader.</p> <p>And we think that, essentially, it doesn't bring scientific news, it's more an apology of the method. However, the article is interesting and, above all, extraordinarily didactic, the authors dominate clearly the basic concepts of regression methods.</p>	<p>I agree with the reviewer's comment and the appropriate corrections will be made. Though, this work is not for identifying determinants of phenomena since the dependent variable is not a categorical variable but a continuous one.</p> <p>The Corrections have been noted and would be made with immediate effect.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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