

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2483
Title of the Manuscript:	AN INTERESTING MODEL-INDEPENDENT LOWER BOUND FOR THE PRICE OF SWISS RE MORTALITY BOND 2003
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 article provides a model for determining the pricing of catastrophic mortality bonds. The author/s use a model-independent lower bound approach while considering other models. However, lack of clarity and structure of argumentation obscures the thesis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. A MODEL-INDEPENDENT LOWER BOUND FOR THE PRICE OF SWISS RE MORTALITY BOND 2003	
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 lists the models the paper will consider. The abstract needs the addition of a clear thesis statement highlighting the original contribution of the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The section order is sufficient. The sentence and paragraph structure in several sections needs revision.	
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.	This paper provides analysis for the valuation of securities. Such a model could benefit insurers in determining pay out. The paper would require addressing issues of clarity before being able to determine the correctness of the argument.	

Review Form 2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The paper uses sufficient and recent articles reflecting extensive research.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper contains grammatical and spelling errors. In addition to wording choices not reflecting the quality of a scholarly article.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarah Frances Hicks
Department, University & Country	European Graduate School, United States