

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	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2. This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and very interesting, but ideally a good title is one that has/shows: [a] topical substance, [b] research context, [c] describing research methods, [d] value & originality. 3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite good and has been equipped with a. the purpose of the research conducted, b. The research method used, c. The main findings or results of the research, d. Originality and value of the research conducted, e. Implications of the studies conducted. 4. I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are <i>quite good</i> and <i>appropriate</i>. The subsections in this manuscript are <i>very complete</i> with a <i>coherent</i> and <i>structured</i> way of writing. 5. This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, <i>Model description and Formulation</i>, significant findings, Sensitivity Analysis, Simulation Results and Discussion, have all been well and clearly stated. The proposed model used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Textbook, Proceedings (<i>Conference Article</i>) and Journals. Considering that some of the references used are somewhat outdated and the number is minimal (only 12 references), kindly add several other related references to support the discussion in this manuscript. <p>SPECIAL COMMENT This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, Model description and Formulation have all been well and clearly stated. The methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct. Not all references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Textbook, Proceedings (<i>Conference Article</i>) and Journals. Considering that some of the references used are somewhat outdated and the number is minimal (only 12 references), kindly add several other related references to support the discussion in this manuscript. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Good enough</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Accept with very Minor Revision</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:	Yusuf Suryo Utomo
Department, University & Country	Indonesia