

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_98634
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Maternal Factors for Predicting Birth Outcomes in Ghana
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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- Yes, this manuscript is important to the medical field as it assesses the association of various maternal and neonatal factors with birth outcomes.</p> <p>2- I would recommend changing the title into "Statistical Modelling of Maternal and Neonatal Factors to Predict Birth Outcomes in Ghana".</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract looks appropriate and comprehensive.</p> <p>4- The structure of manuscript and subsections are correct.</p> <p>5- Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct but I recommend to recheck the 95% confidence interval for odds ratio. For factors with significant association, the 95% confidence interval should not include zero in the interval. On the other hand, those factors with non-significant association, the 95% confidence interval should include zero within their interval.</p> <p>6- The references are recent but some paragraphs and sentences are left with no citation.</p> <p>7- What was the software used for statistical analysis for this study?</p> <p>8- What AIC and BIC abbreviations stand for?</p> <p>9- Authors are advised to change "standard error" into "standard error of mean".</p> <p>10- Authors should explain what is Apgar score?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Authors should check manuscript for spelling and punctuations mistakes.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq