Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPAS_51127**
Title of the Manuscript:	**An updated algorithm for moderate censoring in time-to-event data using rank-based regression**
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

	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		
Minor REVISION comments	In situations where there is no clear best parametric fit for time-to-event data with moderate level of censoring, the proposed method provides a robust alternative to obtain regression coefficients (both adjusted and unadjusted) with a performance comparable to that of a proportional hazards model. In my opinion, the paper is well written and organized. The work of the paper is correct. However, there are some comments to improve the quality of the paper which are given as follows: • In the introduction part, the author should give more background works in details about advantages of the proposed method over the existing methods	Yes, this sentence mistakenly appeared two times in the ABSTRACT. I have corrected this error now. Thank you for pointing this out. It now appears only once in the ABSTRACT. Thank you for your positive comment on my work. In the ABSTRACT (under "Results"), I have now added a sentence that reads "In a real-life example pertaining to pancreatic cancer study, the proposed method performed admirably well and provided a more realistic interpretation about the effect of covariates (age and Karnofsky score) compared to a standard parametric (lognormal) model." This aspect of the model is also discussed in the Section 3.2 where the readers may see the advantage of the proposed method. The main advantage of the proposed model is its "robustness", and this has been reiterated throughout the text. In the Introduction Section, I have also given multiple references about work done by other authors and the main advantages have been discussed in the Methods and Results sections. Thank you for your suggestions. It has helped me a lot in improving my manuscript.
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	