

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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agree highlight that part in the mar his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Nothing	
Minor REVISION comments	 (1) On page 2, "It ,however, took Gompertz" should be replaced with "It, however, took Gompertz". (2) On page 3, "Its been almost four years now since" should be replaced with "It has been almost four years now since". (3) In Eq.(2.1), "exp" should be replaced with "e". (4) In Eq.(2.2), "exp" should be replaced with "e". (5) On page 5, "(206-2018)" should be revised. (6) In the second equation on page 7, "exp" should be replaced with "e". 	
Optional/General comments	 (1) On page 5, the value of Δt is not specified. If Δt = 1 year, please add it. (2) On page 6, please stipulate which routine in MATLAB you used for this optimization. (3) On page 6, if three-year data is used for drawing Fgure 1, please state it. (4) In Figure 2 on page 7, which year does the year 1 on x-axis correspond to? Is it 2015? or 2016? Please express it clearly. (5) On page 9, you wrote " From the table, it can be seen that the error associated with model parameters are quite small indicating that our forecast is quite accurate. ". Please add the reason of this conclusion. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed that part in the manuscript. It is feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kunio Takezawa
Department, University & Country	Japan

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her