EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Assessing Biometric Predictors of Gestational Age Among Pregnant Women in the Upper East Region of Ghana: The Quadratic Classifier Approach"**

Submitted: 12 September 2025
Accepted: 12 October 2025
Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Abukari Alhassan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Xi Chen
University of Kentucky, USA

Reviewer 2: Gilchrist Laly
Institut Régional de Santé Publique Comlan Alfred Quenum (IRSP-CAQ), Ouidah, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Mohammed Alameen
Ummulaqura University, Faculty of Public Health & Health Informatics, Saudi Arabia

---
Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear and in accordance with the content of the manuscript.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The statistical method is particularly well detailed, which allows for optimal understanding. However, some shortcomings that could improve the quality of the already good work have been noted in the body of the attached article.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Yes
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Yes
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the focus of the article. It specifies the population, subject, and methodology. However, it could benefit from slightly less technical phrasing to broaden accessibility.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract sets out the objectives, methods, and principal results in a logical order. It gives the reader a sound overview of the research context and findings. Nonetheless, the writing could be polished for clarity, especially in distinguishing between objectives and results.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The article is generally well-written and communicates technical material clearly. That said, there are occasional lapses in grammar and awkward phrasing (e.g., “diagnosed of gestational diabetes”), as well as typographical slips. These do not obscure meaning but detract from polish. A careful proofreading is recommended.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methodology is described with commendable rigour. The statistical procedures (discriminant analysis and quadratic classifier) are introduced clearly, and the assumptions are acknowledged and tested. The choice of cross-validation is appropriate and strengthens the validity of the results. Some explanatory figures or flowcharts would improve accessibility for non-specialist readers.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The paper is logically structured, beginning with a well-contextualised introduction, moving through methods, results, and discussion. The tables are informative and well laid out, though the narrative occasionally repeats information already given numerically. The text is dense in places; pruning could heighten readability.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion is sound, supported by the results, and appropriately cautious. It highlights parity as the leading predictor and suggests avenues for biochemical investigation. This is a well-judged balance of statistical inference and biological interpretation.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive and appropriate, spanning both global literature and Ghanaian studies. The formatting is largely correct, though minor inconsistencies exist in author initials and punctuation. A careful alignment of in-text citations with the reference list is recommended.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Revise the language for grammar and fluency; a professional proofread would add polish.
Clarify distinctions between aims, methods, and findings in the abstract.
Consider reducing repetition between narrative text and tabular data.
Provide a brief justification for the focus on quadratic discriminant analysis rather than linear or logistic alternatives.
Review and standardize references carefully.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
No
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Not clear abstract, need to be more specific
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Yes
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Need to be improved with more details
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
No
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
No, need to be improved to show clear consice conclusion
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
