



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_26043
Title of the Manuscript:	Tweedie Model for Analyzing Zero-Inflated Continuous Response: An Application to Job Training Data
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• Abstract should include sample size and practical implications of the study. • Significance and rationale of study is missing. • Literature review is missing; it should include at least 20-25 research papers and follow (1) proper organisation of ideas (2) relevance to variables under study. • Research design is unclear. • Better interpretation of results on basis of hypothesis/problem under discussion. • More references should be used in introduction, data analysis and findings.	• We now included sample size and practical implication of the study in the abstract highlighted in blue. • We have now extended the section to better explain the significance and rationale of the study. • We have now added few more references in the introduction section and rest of the paper. • We have now clearly explained all research tools in the methods section (please see the 2.6: the last paragraph) and also please see the 2.6.1 for the explanation of the statistical methods used. • We have noticed that due to the format changed some of our explanations on the section 2.6 were not well represented. We have now corrected that part. • For better interpretation of results, we have used odds ratio highlighted in blue. • More references have been used in the suggested section.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• More references required. • Need more explanation on how research result will help the managers/academia/practitioners at large.	• More references have been added and highlighted in blue. • We have added a new section (please see section-5) to explain how the research result will help the manages/academia/ practitioners at large.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		