[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

| Journal Name: | [Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science](#) |
|---|---|
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_JAMCS_49629** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Forecasting Maternal Mortality with Modified Gompertz Model** |
| Type of the 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](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline))

**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 | - The authors focused on the possibility of achieving reduction in mortality rate by 68% under the SDG objective. However, the model can be applied to the available data in making predictions, and the outcome of the analysis can only suggest to policy makers on how to further reduce Maternal mortality.<br><br>- SDG initiative (206-2018) should be checked under "fitting the data"<br><br>-The equations needs to be numbered<br><br>-The authors should justify modelling number of death (Survival) with Binomial distribution, which was later approximated to Poisson. The Poisson model should be checked, x! is missing.<br><br>-The data used for the forecast needs to be sufficiently described.<br><br>-"Ghana needs to reduce its maternal mortality by a further 3.32 percent annually" which result justifies this statement? | All changes done |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | | |
| **Optional/General** comments | The authors have proposed a good model, and the work would be more appreciated if the authors can discuss the results well enough. | |

**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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |