

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_123768
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of a climate model for forecasting and alerting meningitis epidemics in Burkina Faso.
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper proposes a model to work on the meningitis epidemics and their effect on the economies of developing African countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is very okay	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is too short, the abstract does not reveal the outcome of the analysis of the data collected from the period mentioned and the effect on the economy of the affected	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All section are okay except that the discussion does not say anything about the effect meningitis epidemics have on the economy of the so affected countries	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The discussions revealed certain elements capable of potentiating the recurrence of seasonal meningitis epidemics. These are environmental issues, such as poorly-designed built environment, crowded sleeping and poorly ventilated rooms, dry and dusty weather condition. Other elements were economic challenges, such as poor household living conditions, neighbourhood deprivation, and socio-cultural elements, such as poor healthcare seeking behaviour, social mixing patterns, inadequate vaccination and vaccine hesitancy. The research is robust enough with the length of data used	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are although sufficient but can be improved	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Very suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
	The research can be improved by adding the factors can help cobbed the effect of meningitis epidemics and also how the countries affected can improved the economy	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ogunjimi Olalekan L. Abdulrasheed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Phoenix University Agwada, Nigeria</b>