



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_41699
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Count Data from Dependent Clusters with Poisson Mixed Models
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	There is a strong need to correct a lot of grammatical errors in this paper. Line 79: would be used to establish.. Beta in model (1) in this study 162: Quassi to read Quasi 180: delete the in model (a) 205: At the second 372: equationcan-separate the two 382: change fro to for 437: define McCulloch's EM and reference 381: metropolis algorithm (need reference her!) 437: APPLICATION. I have serious problem with this in terms of repeatability for other researchers. Yes, R glmm was used. I cannot reproduce his results because there was no appendix of the implementation of his procedure in R> The author/s need to include their implementation algorithm so that other readers can benefit from this without re-inventing the wheel. I will not recommend acceptance without this being met.	All errors identified were corrected. -corrected. -corrected. -Corrected. -Deleted. -Corrected -Separated. -Changed. -Defined and added references. -Added references. - Added R program as a separate file, because it needs nearly six pages.
Minor REVISION comments	AS mentioned before, need for grammatical errors correction-especially noun-verb agreement	- Corrected all grammatical errors identified.
Optional/General comments	The paper is very good and adds to the existing body of knowledge. The mathematics is elegant and well derived.	