

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_123321
Title of the Manuscript:	A Covid-19 Post-Vaccination Stability Analysis For A Modified Sir Mathematical Model In Kenya.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The mathematical model was well defined and the ideology was good. The introduction was Well written. The methodologies were analysed where ever needed. Overall, the paper is impressive.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Change the order of sections as 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.2 in Introduction. Section 3.0 as 3.1 and 4.0 as 4.1 Section 2.1 is missing	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	After equation 4, the equation is equal to 1 or 4? In description of variables V is not defined... and N defined is not mentioned in equations. Check the equations and correct from equations 13 to 19, 25 to 27, 1 st term in 30, After equation 33 In section 4.0, Vaccination rate ρ or p , check the complete section Check the subscripts such as R_v	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes its sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Check the grammar and spelling..... In Introduction, change 'this casual jobs ' as ' these casual jobs', 'they detail that age' as 'they detailed that age' . In post vaccination projections, 'figure 4 show that' as figure 4 shows that' Yes language is good.	
Optional/General comments	Check the reference style and correct the refrence part	

Review Form 3

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:	Naga Soundarya Lakshmi V.S.V.
Department, University & Country	Thiruvalluvar University, India