Comments from the peer reviewer

We received several suggestions from the peer reviews.

From the first peer, the peer was hard to distinguish the explanatory variables and response variables. We agree with this point, and we shall explain about the variables in the revised version of the paper. The peer also advised that our paper did not explain about the background of the model. We will partially accept this suggestion. Our intended readers already know what the Rasch model is, so we do not have to explain the basic backgrounds of the models. However, we shall distinguish the difference of the models more clearly in the paper. The peer claimed we should demonstrate on how to calculate AIC. We would not accept this because our intended audience have basic knowledge of statistics and regression modeling.

From the second peer, the peer suggested to move the description of the data to the method section. We will accept this advice. The peer also suggested to change the position of the table. We will accept this advice. The peer argued that we should add background knowledge about what MLE is and which MLE is the best. We would not accept this comment because, again, our intended audience are trained in basic statistics.