

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_103924
Title of the Manuscript:	AN SVEIR COVID-19 MATHEMATICAL MODEL WITH DOUBLE DOSE VACCINATION
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The author gives a concrete introduction, organized research methodology, comprehensive analysis, and detailed result discussion of "SVEIR Covid-19 Mathematical Model with Double Dose Vaccination" suitable for the scientific community with supporting mathematical proofs and demonstrations across the sections of the manuscripts.</p> <p>However, there are still some little problems in the paper. The author is suggested to make some revisions so that the paper will be better.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract should not be less than 150 words containing background, objectives, significance, and relevance of the study. Keywords should be written with initial capitals. Please include a conclusion and recommendations <p>The references are recent with current reviews of works of literature to substantiate the claims of the knowledge gap and the relevance of the research paper in filling this gap by modelling ways to manage the corona virus while taking the contact rate and vaccination into consideration.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Appropriate professional terminologies are used in demonstrating the research methodologies and findings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think the paper is good on the whole. It is clearly written and well organized. The study purpose, method, and result are all clearly illustrated. The tables are exact and make the study more convictive. The paper is suitable for publication if the corrections are made to make it better.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Casmir Chidiebere Onyeneke
Department, University & Country	University of the People, USA