

From : Stan Lipovetsky (GfK)
<Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>

Rab, Sep 10, 2014 01:21 AM

Subject : RE: Second Review on MASA559/2014

To : bambangs@unsri.ac.id

 Reply  Reply All  Forward  Print



----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Lipovetsky (GfK) <Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>
To: bambangs@unsri.ac.id
Sent: Mon, 28 Apr 2014 09:47:15 +0700 (WIT)
Subject: review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,
Could you please review a paper MASA559/2014, attached?
Thanks much,
Best regards,
MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief
Stan Lipovetsky.

-----Original Message-----

From: bambangs@unsri.ac.id [mailto:bambangs@unsri.ac.id]
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 9:23 AM
To: Lipovetsky, Stan (GfK)
Subject: Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Stan Lipovetsky.
MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief

Thank you very much for your belief in me to review a paper
MASA559/2014. I will try to do it and do best as I could.

Best regards,

Bambang Suprihatin
University of Sriwijaya

-----Original Message-----

From: bambangs@unsri.ac.id [mailto:bambangs@unsri.ac.id]
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 9:23 AM
To: Lipovetsky, Stan (GfK)
Subject: Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Stan Lipovetsky
MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief

Attached is the reviewed paper MASA559/2014. The manuscript contains a good idea, but the author(s) much more use the simulation results as the conclusion. The paper will be better if it is completed with the formally proof. However, this is only my opinion as consideration, and not judgement. When the manuscript has been revised, I am ready to review again. Thank you.

Best regards

Bambang Suprihatin
University of Sriwijaya

-----Original Message-----

From: Lipovetsky, Stan (GfK)
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 9:53 AM
To: 'bambang@unsri.ac.id'
Subject: RE: Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,

Thank you very much,

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief
Stan Lipovetsky.

----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Lipovetsky (GfK) <Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>
To: bambang@unsri.ac.id
Sent: Mon, 18 Aug 2014 09:46:57 +0700 (WIT)
Subject: RE: Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,

Attached please find the revised paper MASA559/2014 and a letter describing changes made due to your review.

Look please and let me know your opinion on the revision.

Thank you,

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief
Stan Lipovetsky.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lipovetsky, Stan (GfK)
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2014 1:40 PM
To: 'bambang@unsri.ac.id'
Subject: RE: Second Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,

Thank you, it's received.

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief
Stan Lipovetsky.

----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Lipovetsky (GfK) <Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>
To: bambangs@unsri.ac.id
Sent: Fri, 05 Sep 2014 09:40:47 +0700 (WIT)
Subject: RE: Second Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,

Attached please find the 2nd revision of the paper MASA559/2014 and a letter describing changes made due to your review. Look please and let me know your opinion on the revision.

Thank you,

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief
Stan Lipovetsky.

-----Original Message-----

From: bambangs@unsri.ac.id [mailto:bambang@unsri.ac.id]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 1:15 PM
To: Lipovetsky, Stan (GfK)
Subject: RE: Second Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Stan Lipovetsky
MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief

All my comments have been answered/clarified well. Attached is my 3rd comment on Masa559-2014. In the paper, there are four (namely A, B, C, and D) appendices. All appendices are the theories needed to the manuscript. My suggestion is, the author does not have to include the appendices in the text. As we agree about the layout of the journal, usually they do not contain such appendices. The author could cite some theories and write down in the text if necessary. My opinion is, I recommend this paper to be accepted.
Thank you,

Best regards,

Bambang Suprihatin
Sriwijaya University

----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Lipovetsky (GfK) <Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>
To: bambangs@unsri.ac.id
Sent: Sat, 06 Sep 2014 09:40:47 +0700 (WIT)
Subject: RE: Second Review on MASA559/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,
Thank you very much,

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief
Stan Lipovetsky

From : Stan Lipovetsky (GfK)
<Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>

Kam, Sep 11, 2014 12:15 AM

Subject : RE: Review for MASA594/2014

To : bambangs@unsri.ac.id

 Reply  Reply All  Forward  Print



----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Lipovetsky (GfK) <Stan.Lipovetsky@gfk.com>
To: bambangs@unsri.ac.id
Sent: Mon, 18 Aug 2014 01:17:02 +0700 (WIT)
Subject: Review for MASA594/2014

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,

How are you doing?

Could you please review the paper MASA594/2014, attached?

Thank you very much,

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Stan Lipovetsky

-----Original Message-----

From: bambangs@unsri.ac.id [mailto:bambang@unsri.ac.id]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 12:06 PM
To: Lipovetsky, Stan (GfK)
Subject: Review for MASA594/2014

Dear Dr. Stan Lipovetsky
MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief

Attached is my review for MASA594/2014.

The idea of research is OK, but it is not well-written as the journal format/layout as I comment in the review. But I suggest that he author should rewrite the paper for possible to be published in MASA.

Thank you.

Best regards

Bambang Suprihatin

Univ of Sriwijaya

Dear Dr. Suprihatin,

Thank you very much,

Best regards,

MASA Co-Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Stan Lipovetsky

Acknowledgment

Co-Editor-in-Chief Stan Lipovetsky thanks the referees contributed in reviewing the papers in 2014:

Sangeeta Arora, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
Dinesh R. Barot, Institute of Commerce, Ahmedabad University, India
Debasis Bhattacharya, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, India
Carlos Bouza, University of Habana, Cuba
James Brofos, Dartmouth College, Hanover NH, USA
Wenyaw Chan, University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA
Prem Chandra, Hamad Medical Corporation, Doha, Qatar
Eugene Demidenko, Dartmouth College, Hanover NH, USA
Kajal Dihidar, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India
Marcin Dudzinski, Warsaw University, Poland
Konrad Furmanczyk, Warsaw University, Poland
Larry Gould, Merck Research Laboratories, NorthWales, PA, USA
Hui Gong, Valparaiso University, IN, USA
Thomas Hanne, University of Applied Sciences, Olten, Switzerland
Xiang Huang, New York University School of Medicine, NY, USA
Jong-Min Kim, University of Minnesota at Morris, MN, USA
Maxwell L. King, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia
Rajan Lamichhane, Dept. of Mathematics, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, USA
Xue Mary Lin, FDA, Rockville MD, USA
Vladimir Ladyzhets, University of Connecticut, Stamford, USA
Ilya Lipkovich, Quintiles Innovation, Morrisville, NC, USA
Igor Mandel, Telmar Inc., New York NY, USA
Vishal Mehta, Vikram University, Ujjain, India
Arnold Mitnitski, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
Vitaliy Molostvov, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia?
Boris Mirkin, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
Ranjit Kumar Paul, IASRI, New Delhi, India
Henry Penikas, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
Gyan Prakash, S. N. Medical College, Agra, India
Sudesh Pundir, Pondicherry University, India
Piyush Kant Rai, Banasthali University, Rajasthan, India
Shesh Nath Rai, University of Louisville, KY, USA
Soma Roychowdhury, Indian Institute of Social Welfare and Business, Calcutta, India
Arkady Shemyakin, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN, USA
Housila P. Singh, School of Studies in Statistics, Vikram University, Ujjain, India
Sarjinder Singh, Dept. of Mathematics, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, USA
Jambulingam Subramani, College of Engineering and Technology, Tamilnadu, India
Shu-Ching Su, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, USA
Bambang Suprihatin, University of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia
A.K.P.C. Swain, Orissa, India
Khreshna I.A. Syuhada, Institute of Technology, Bandung, Indonesia
Aerambamoorthy Thavaneswaran, University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada
Montip Tiensuwan, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

Eldho Varghese, Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute, New Delhi, India

Boris Vilge, Concretec Ltd., Lapid, Israel?

Jichen Yang, University of Texas Southwestern, USA

Boris Zaslavsky, FDA, Rockville MD, USA

Wenfei Zhang, Sanofi, USA

Ming Zhu, AbbVie, Chicago, USA

Guohua Zou, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, Chin

And special thanks to:

- Editor-in-Chief, Professor Sarjinder Singh, Texas, USA, for organizing the special issue of MASA vol. 9, #1, 2014, on Randomized Response Techniques;
- Guest Editor, Professor Alexander Topchishvili, Marburg, Germany, for organizing the special issue of MASA vol. 9, #3, 2014, on Statistical Estimations in Complex Problems.

Reviewer 1: Reply to second review comments for MASA559/2014.

1. Page 6, 4th line from bottom. In the counting of $\frac{1.0}{(0.5+1.0)} = 0.67$, mathematically it is not correct. It should be replaced with $\frac{1.0}{0.5+1.0} = 2/3$ or (correct to two decimal places). Note that the use of bracket is not appropriate, so without bracket is better.

Reply: I have changed it to $\frac{1.0}{0.5+1.0} = \frac{2}{3}$

2. Page 22, section 6 of conclusion. I also did not say that the conclusion is valid for general case. I only comment that the conclusion is based on the simulation study, and I ask whether the conclusion is valid for general case. Usually, the simulation can't be employed to conclude the study in general. The simulation is only used as an application of the main result. So, I suggest the author to rewrite the conclusion in "appropriate way", because the conclusion is the crucial part of the paper.

Reply: I have rewritten the conclusion which I hope is more appropriate and addresses this issue.

3. In the Figure 1, are these the distribution? These are the boxplots and not distribution.

Reply: I have changed the caption for Figure 1 replacing the word "Distributions" to "Box plots".

Similarly, I have replaced the word "distributions" to "box plots" in the text on page 12:

"The box plots are close to symmetrical for $T \geq 120$, and show that asymptotically the estimate approaches the true value. Again, as T decreases, the shape of the box plots become more positively skewed for the multivariate method."

Comments for MASA559/2014

The paper discusses about the univariate and multivariate approaches to seasonal adjustment of aggregate series of different lengths. The idea of research is good, but the author(s) should be aware with the following comments, which are divided into two parts.

A. General Comments

1. Abstract should to be presented in only one paragraph.
2. The manuscript is too long, there are 47 pages including tables and appendices. The author(s) should rewrite in **concise version**, usually ranging from 6 to 20 pages (but it is not compulsory maximum 20 pages).
3. If the appendices only consist the theory can even be excluded from the manuscript, or can be moved into the main text if necessary.
4. The manuscript much more depict the simulation results rather than the mathematical results. Indeed, the simulation is used as the application of the main result.

B. Detail Comments

1. Page 4, 1st line (and elsewhere of the manuscript). The phrase “the model parameters” should be replace with “the parameters of model”.
2. Page 4, 6th line from bottom. “... lengths $T = 20,24,28,40,80,120,240$.” should be replaced with “... lengths $T = 20,24,28,40,80,120$, and 240 .”
3. Page 5, 4th line. What the word “it” refer for? Because there are some “subjetcs” such as Y_t , L_t , and S_t .
4. Page 5, equation 1. The layout of the number of equation (or compound of equations) should be adjusted, where the number of equation is not in the new line.
5. Page 7, 7th line. In the statement “Time series of lengths 5 to 7 years are...”. The author should mention/cite the reference for this statement. Moreover, should the unit time is “year” such that the lengths are short, moderate and long?
6. Page 8, 4th line. In the definition of c -ratio, why the formula for $Var(L_{1,t+1} - L_{1t})$ is $Var(L_{1,t+1} - L_{1t}) = \sigma_{\eta}^2 + \sigma_{1\eta}^2$? The author did not mention that $L_{1,t+1}$ and L_{1t} are independent yet.

7. Page 8, the last line. The word “the parameters” should be corrected as “the estimated parameters”.
8. Page 9, 3rd line. In the statement “... the ration of ...= 0.67.” The author should explain in brief about this number.
9. Page 12, 2nd line. The phrase “and solved to give” should be corrected as “and solved for $\sigma_{U,\varepsilon}^2$ to give”.
10. Page 21, Layout for sub-sub section 5.1.1. There is only one sub-sub section namely 5.1.1. (three digits). If this is one and the only one, the author should not make the number of such sub-sub section. Similarly comment for the sub-sub section 5.2.1.
11. Page 25, 5th line. Why the author only concern on $T = 28$ for the bootstrapping? There are seven T s, but why only one T was used whereas the author should study for diferent lengths? This situation could affect the bias of conclusion.
12. Page 26, 3rd line. The statement “The Rel-Bias for the multivariate has reduced from -25.87% ...”. Mathematically, we say that from -25.87% to 4.46% is increase, not reduce. So, the author should write in appropriate, for example in absolute value sense.
13. Page 26, section 6 of conclusion. The author mentioned that the conclusion is based on the simulation study. The author concluded that the bias of the estimated parameters was much less for multivariate model than for the univariate model. Is this conclusion valid for general cases? Usually, the simulation can't be employed to conclude the study in general. The simulation is usually used as application of the main result.
14. In the Figure, the author doesn't label the Y-axis, so please write down.