SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**2015_BJMCS_18616**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CLUSTER ANALYSIS AS A STRATEGY OF GROUPING TO CONSTRUCT GOODNESS-OF-FIT TESTS WHEN THE CONTINUOUS COVARIATES PRESENT IN THE LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL**
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	**CLUSTER ANALYSIS AS A STRATEGY OF GROUPING TO CONSTRUCT GOODNESS-OF-FIT TEST WHEN THE CONTINUOUS COVARIATES PRESENT IN THE LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL.** • I have read the article an I present my view as follows. ➢ .the abstract is fine and requires no adjustment. ➢ The introduction is rather too lengthy and the authors could consider providing more citations than re-writing the literature already known. ➢ They, authors, are proposing a new approach, it is better that in the literature they concentrate more on that existing approach(es) for which they are going to compare what they have proposed. ➢ Line 159 section 2; the authors should consider stating more clearly the proposed method without mixing up with what others have done or what others methods do. ➢ I have noticed that subsequent comparison of the proposed method and the already existing methods at a go (see section 2) creates a lot of confusion and it becomes hard for any reader to fillow the development of the proposed	

	method. ➢ I suggest that the authors, Firstly document the procedure of development for the proposed method and later in the text bring out the differences (however, this has been done somewhere in the last parts) ➢ Section 2 and 3 are a little confusing I suggest that the authors consider writing them as one, since section 2 seems to be dealing with the same thing that could be done or is being done in section 3, though presented mathematically. ➢ I have major concerns with the Table3, first line 382, Table 3 shows the percent of time each……that section of the sentence looks not sound to me. ➢ The results are totally confusing in the explanation section, the authors MUST consider presenting a table that is self-explanatory To justify my concern, they talk of alpha in line 386 and this does not present anywhere in the Table3. I believe they have confused "m and alpha " at some point. ➢ Authors should clearly mention whether the presented models in the table are vector presenting or otherwise, else it will be hard to rely on the results which have such a small number of explanatory variables. Regardless of the several explained variables simulated. ➢ The algorithm for the proposed method should be well and clearly written not to	

	be mixed up with other already existing methods as it is currently.	
Minor REVISION comments	➢ Check line 238 for grammatical correctness (is!!!) ➢ Line 249, between process and often insert "that" ➢ Line 252, change calculate to "calculating" ➢ Lines 363 and 364, read the last phrase and make sure they make more meaning. " excluded terms"!!!!	
Optional/General comments	The authors take into account the changes suggested to the satisfaction of the Editor. The methodological development of the paper cannot followed or is hard to fillow.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Kikawa richard cliff***
Department, University & Country	***Dept of Maths and Stats, Tshwane University of Technology , South Africa***