

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_105413
Title of the Manuscript:	A Susceptible Vaccinated Exposed Infected Hospitalized and Removed/Recovered (SVEIHR) Model Framework for COVID-19
Type of the 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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the community in the sense that it brings a full picture of a basic mathematical model for covid'19 with all the necessary interventions. The results are well-known. This study is not clear why it is being done.</p> <p>2. The title does not make sense in one sentence. The title is written as one sentence to describe different compartments of the disease model. This cannot be written in one sentence. Also the title does not reflect what is being studied.</p> <p>3. The abstract seems to be part of the introduction; it does not reflect the problem in question, the methodology, and the main findings of the research. The last sentence in the abstract refers R0 being less than 0, this cannot be correct as R0 is normally measured with reference to the threshold 1.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct; it just runs through the main procedures of studying a mathematical model in diseases. Displaying the compartmental models, writing down the equations, finding the equilibrium points; disease-free and endemic points, stability analysis and displaying simulations when parameters are changed.</p> <p>6. The references are only for 2019, 2020 and 2021; references need to be within the past 10 years. The scope of the study was too narrow.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language can still be improved by using language checks.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study can be improved by clearly stating the aims of the study and modifying the title</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gilbert Makanda
Department, University & Country	Central University of Technology, South Africa