



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29533
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction Consistency of Lasso Regression Does Not Need Normal Errors
Type of the Article	Short communication

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some minor typing mistakes are in the manuscript (refer the attached document). In the abstract write clearly the objective of this paper. The only difference that I noticed this with compared to Chatterjee (2014) is that in this article error variance is $\sigma^2(i)$ whereas in the previous one, the variance is σ^2 for all errors.	I have corrected them based on your attached document. I have extended the abstract to formulate the objectives of the paper. The main difference is in generalization of the upper bound for data having generally non-normal errors (noise).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Thank you very much for your comments. They improve the quality of the paper.