SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPAS_46563**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Statistical Analysis Based on Lake Michigan Fish Acoustic Data Using LASSO Method**
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	• The author(s) should go over the paper and use math style where necessary and not type directly from the keyboard. • The author(s) mentioned in the Abstract that "This paper is to develop and explore LASSO method" was LASSO method developed by the author(s)? • The author(s) should connect their sentences well enough; this was observed in the introduction. They do not necessarily need not to stress the variables and statistical software SAS in the introduction, this would be more appreciated under the Material and Method. • Some of the languages and reporting language used are not scientific • Sufficient literatures were not reviewed	We have corrected the manuscript as per the comments Abstract corrected Corrected and revised Language edited Literature review added
Minor REVISION comments	• Citation/ references were not properly done • No table or chats for results in the body of the work except in the Appendix • Discussion of result should be improved upon • The author(s) should thorough read through and correct grammatical errors in the paper. Some few errors have been highlighted in red ink, on the paper. Please find attached the paper along with the Review.	All correction made Discussion part has been improved Grammatical error has been removed
Optional/General comments	The motivation behind work is great, the work shows that the author(s) have invested sufficient time to come up with this paper. However, they should do the needful in order to make their effort worthwhile.	Thank you for your valuable commnets

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	None, similarity index following TURNITIN plagiarism checks was 21%, it can be further trimmed down.	