



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_45779
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF HOUSEHOLD ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION IN NONRESIDENT RENT HALLS USING LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS 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>)



SDI 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	<p>1. The article is overall very well written. I even find it strange how well written it generally is.</p> <p>2. Despite the English being very good, some sentences are too long. A few times the punctuation is misplaced or missing.</p> <p>3. Despite the structure being good and clear, it is a copy-past from a thesis, and not the structure of a scientific article to be published in a journal. In fact, I even red a sentence stating "in this chapter...", which clearly shows that the authors copy-pasted from a thesis (I hope at least a thesis of their own and not someone else's). Submitting to scientific journals demands more care and dedication.</p> <p>4. Another example of the point above is the dissertation on alternative methods as econometrics and time-series. Although its reading was interesting, it was absolutely irrelevant for this article and its findings.</p> <p>5. The explanation on regression analysis was excessively detailed. This work is about the application of regression analysis to study a subject. The core of the work should be the subject and not the regression analysis. The methods section felt like a textbook on regression analysis. But for that we do have actual textbooks.</p> <p>6. One thing missing from the methods is a clear presentation of the dependent and independent variables.</p> <p>7. After the methods, the remaining work widely underachieved. The results are only one regression. There is no Discussion at all and instead only a few lines of Conclusions. I have never red a work published in these terms. And what are the findings? Only that electricity consumption is proportional to the number of consumers! I guess the same way as the amount of gasoline consumed by a car is proportional to the amount of miles driven. It seems pretty obvious and not worth publishing an article to state something so obvious. But I may have skipped something that makes it worth reading for the specialized audience.</p> <p>I suggest that the authors consider my comments and review at least some of these aspects.</p>	corrected
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

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>	