

## 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> )

### 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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Dear respected editor, the idea is very good but some points need to be clarified.</p> <p><b>1.</b> To make a difference, Initiatives in the manuscript are required. For example, in my opinion, it is better to add at least 1 table to the text.</p> <p><b>2.</b> The title could be better.</p> <p><b>3.</b> No, it is not. The abstract should be rewritten and the overall objective of the manuscript should be introduced.</p> <p><b>4.</b> Sections and subsections in the text are not numbered correctly. The study does not present materials and methods. The criteria for inclusion/exclusion of the studies were not informed, nor the methodology for the acquisition of the studies used.</p> <p><b>5.</b> The manuscript is more like a descriptive essay or book chapter. There is not much "reviewing" of sources as it involves some level of analysis and critical evaluation of the articles.</p> <p><b>6.</b> References are not sufficient and mostly not correctly represented. For a review article it should include at least 50 references.</p> <p>Authors can better follow the basics of essay writing; have a central point in each paragraph, argue it with evidence, then finally synthesize and summarize to bring all the points together to the main point.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The entire article should be checked for minor grammatical errors, punctuation, etc.;</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>For quick comprehension, increasing visual appeal, and improving paper quality, it is suggested adding schematics or tables. Suggest to the author to report the meaning of the abbreviations. I recommend publishing it after reviewing the manuscript.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zagrai Gavrilă</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Saint Sylvester Secondary School, Romania</b>