

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_83840
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Comparison of Ordinary Least Squares and Quantile Regression with Nigerian Financial Data on Trade Balance, Foreign Inflow and Imports.
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>I read the paper and i have some comments as follows;</p> <p>“The study found that the influence of Trade Balance (), Foreign Inflow () and Imports () vary on the Nigerian Gross Domestic Product (Y) depending on the quantile one is looking at. The study recommends the robustness and stability of the Quantile regression model considered as an alternative to the Ordinary Least Square Model.”</p> <p>In these sentences the expressions like the study found or the study recommends are wrong the study cannot find anything, researcher can find i mean instead of the study found i found that via this study or by this study</p> <p>“These methods were applied to the Nigerian Financial Data on Trade Balance (), Foreign Inflow () and Imports () on the Nigerian Gross Domestic Product (Y) collected from Microtrends.net.”</p> <p>Reference is not clear. Not sure if this reference is a website or a book</p> <p>“If a research(er) is concerned in the relationship between two or more variables, he or she will use the regression analysis method” I don't understand why researcher written like research(er) ?</p> <p>“Conditional-mean function for modeling and fitting is one of several regression-modeling techniques, which include the popular basic linear regression model, multiple regression, weighted least squares for models with “heteroscedastic” errors, and non-linear regression models.”</p> <p>I don't understand this sentence because it is complicated. Explanation should be simpler</p> <p>“If the Ordinary least squares (OLS) estimators are considered to be no longer BLUE”</p> <p>The author should explain the conditions about BLUE. I mean the author should mention that under what conditions is OLS not BLUE</p> <p>“Quantile regression” the author should uses capital letters in every word or not in both Finally, it would be more appropriate to combine the results of both regression estimation methods (OLS and quantile) and compare them. The comparison part is a little weak.</p> <p>I hope i could be useful.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aylin Kolbaşı
Department, University & Country	Turkey