

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_97112
Title of the Manuscript:	BETWEEN HOST MODEL FOR CERVICAL CANCER INCORPORATING DIAGNOSIS
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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The topic of this manuscript is quite specific and difficult as it includes the application of cervical cancer infections incorporating diagnosis. The title of this manuscript is okay. The manuscript presents original research results in the area of disease modelling. The author(s) talked about cervical cancer infections incorporating diagnosis but did not see any compartment or parameters mentioning these findings. The manuscript is well designed. The approach was sound and was appropriate for the research question, and the procedures used indicate a clear understanding of methodological principles. The Manuscript is scientifically correct, with some minor comment. The author(s) could do better by mentioning more recent papers to support their claims. The evidence does not depict deep theoretical knowledge. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Authors should always give full meaning of an acronym the first time it used. E.g section 1, the use of "HPV". Perform sensitivity analysis on the parameters, to know the role of the diagnosis parameter in the model. 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eric Neebo Wiah
Department, University & Country	University of Mines and Technology, Ghana