



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_35869
Title of the Manuscript:	Predictive Estimator for Simple 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

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. It would be nice to have a description of the third variance. 2. On page 2, "this least-squares approach indicates the method that minimizes ~" is so well known fact that it is not necessary to explain it again. 3. It would be reasonable to explain the equation (2.3).	1. "((n-1) (\$n\$ is the number of data) in unbiased variance is replaced with (n-4) for reducing predictive error.)" is added just after "For example, the ``third variance''". 2. "This least-squares approach indicates the method that minimizes $E_{sq} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha + \beta x_i - y_i)^2$ \$\$\$ is deleted. 3. "Derivation of \gamma above is described in [1-2]." Is added just after Eq.(2.3).
Minor REVISION comments	4. p is usually used as a correlation coefficient, is it also related the correlation coefficient here? 5. In Figures 1 ~ 3, and 5, the term Distribution does not seem plausible. Aren't these the histograms of the data?	4. "Although, \$\rho\$ is often used as a correlation coefficient, this \$\rho\$ is not related to the correlation coefficient." Is added just after Eq.(2.4). 5. In Figures 1 ~ 3, and 5, "distribution"s are replaced with "histogram"s.
Optional/General comments	6. In Figure 6, can we {\bf Histogram} to converge ~~erlike~~ when \$\beta\$ is greater than 1? 7. You mentioned that \$\beta\$ is constant at page 2, how does ~~var(\$\beta\$)~~ defined in definition (5.1) of \$\Delta\$, Is it a typo and should be ~~var(\$\beta\$)~~? If it is, ~~var(\$\beta\$)~~ must be obtained as:	6. "(this is not fully guaranteed by the limited number of simulations though)" is added. 7. \$\beta\$ just after Eq.(5.1) are replaced with \$\hat{\beta}\$. 8. In equation (5.2) and just below this equation, \$\{var\}(\hat{\beta})\$ is replaced with \$\widehat{var}(\hat{\beta})\$ 9. "The third numerical simulation used



SDI Review Form 1.6

	$\text{var}(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$ 8. In equation (5.2), recheck if $\text{var}(\hat{\beta})$ should be $\widetilde{\text{var}}(\hat{\beta})$. 9. page 10, In the third numerical simulation, what is the sample size? 10. How is the variance of the parameters defined in page 12: "a large variance of the parameters" and "by taking account of the variance of the resulting parameters." Parameter is a constant, shouldn't the variance of the constant be 0?	$n=31$ and $\{x_i\} = \{1^2 - \{\bar{x}\}, 2^2 - \{\bar{x}\}, 3^2 - \{\bar{x}\}, \dots, 31^2 - \{\bar{x}\}\}$; $\{\bar{x}\} = \frac{1}{31} \sum_{i=1}^{31} i^2$." Is added. 10. "In the example used in this paper, ρ is the only parameter in the predictive estimator and the variance of ρ is not 0\$ because it depends on the data." Is added.
--	--	--