

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_99378</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mathematical Models and societal impact of CoVID-19 Pandemic: a short review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. I found this study interesting and relevant in the field. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p> <p>2. This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and very interesting.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite good but has not been equipped with <b>the methods</b> used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problems studied, and the <b>significant findings</b> have not been explicitly and clearly explained. I also suggest that Authors add <b>keywords</b> at the end of the Abstract.</p> <p>4. I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are good enough and appropriate. However, I highly recommend adding a Subsection of <b>Further Research Recommendations</b>, and <b>Acknowledgments</b> to related parties at the end of the manuscript.</p> <p>5. This manuscript has been well written following the method of writing a review article. Research Objectives, Hypotheses, Research Justification, Research Scope, everything has been stated properly and clearly. However, <b>the methods</b> used in solving the problem, the <b>significance and urgency</b> of the problem under study, as well as the <b>significant findings</b> have not been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>.</p> <p>6. <b>Not all references</b> have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by dataset reference not journals. I think the reference very few. I think there are very few reference for a Review Article. Kindly <b>add some references</b> to support discussion more deeply.</p> <p><b>SPECIAL COMMENT</b> This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Review Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study and the, have all been well and clearly stated. However, <b>the methods</b> used in solving the problem, the <b>significance and urgency</b> of the problem under study, as well as the <b>significant findings</b> have not been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>. <b>Not all references</b> have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by dataset reference not journals. I think the reference very few. I think there are very few references for a Review Article. Kindly <b>add some references</b> to support discussion more deeply. I suggest that the author writes <b>suggestions for further research</b> and <b>acknowledgments</b> to related parties at the end of the manuscript. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Good enough	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Accept with Minor Revision	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Suryo Utomo
Department, University & Country	Indonesia