



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_25753
Title of the Manuscript:	Bayesian and frequentist comparison: An application to Low Birth Weight babies in Ghana
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	1. Abstract is too long to cut off and make it concise and logic 2. The difference between Bayes and frequentist is a long time topic, not new. So the aim of this paper is not clear. And motivation of using these 2 methods is not convincible. 3. Add MCMC theory, mathematics background and equation in details in the method section 4. In the data section, quite confused what the data look like. Can author provide a simple snip to show the data 5. The dependent and independent relationships between the variables need to be addressed in details 6. Although authors proposed the methods in LBW associated factors decipher, it is hard to evaluate the contributions of author's work. Please make it convincible and clearly.	1. We sincerely agree. However, since it is less than 350 words as required by the journal, we thought that it could pass 2. The two branches of statistics are not new. However, the application of the Bayesian method has not been popular until recently especially with the advent of high powered computer programs. Again combining the two methods is not common in the literature especially in epidemiology or health in general. And in statistics it is always good especially in health data to compare and come out with appropriate models that are useful in solving problems in this field. Finally, as far as we know this is the first time the two methods are employed to LBW incidence 3. This is provided in the manuscript 4. The data set is from Ghana Statistical Service. A national institution responsible for conducting national surveys and censuses. The data set can be obtained from www.statsghana.gov.gh or The Government Statistician P.O Box 1098 Accra, Ghana upon request. 5. The dependent and independent variables are spelt out in the model specification of the logistic regression model. Due to the number of pages required by the journal, we could not go beyond this. 6. The contribution is that for the first time, we are able to use the two methods to predict incidence of LBW and made suggestions about the two models, the one that is better in predicting LBW – The fact that the Bayesian model even



SDI Review Form 1.6

		without priors is able to predict better than the frequentist.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Grammar and typo in the paper needs corrected 2. Update the reference with recent research results in this field	
Optional/General comments		