

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_88572
Title of the Manuscript:	Mathematical Modelling (SEIPR) of the Therapeutic and Pharmacological Efficacy of Mango Leaf (Mango (Mangifera Indica L.) against selected ravaging infections in third World countries.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The article brings together some useful information about the therapeutic use of Mango Leaf, but it has serious deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the paper needs English and drafting correction.</li> <li>-the references should be numbered in the order in which they appear in the text.</li> <li>-the references are sometimes in round brackets, sometimes in square brackets. They should always be in square brackets.</li> <li>-most of the diseases described in the paper are NOT "ravaging infections". An infection is determined by a microorganism. Diabetes, high blood pressure, or weight gain are not determined by microorganisms.</li> <li>-the article does not prove anything. It contains only a proposed mathematical model, with epidemiological applicability, but which was not tested in the present study using concrete data on the therapeutic effects of mango leaves. Moreover, there is no connection between the proposed mathematical model and the data in the Results and Discussions section.</li> <li>-the authors did not precise the test hypothesis and the null hypothesis.</li> <li>-the information in the Results and Discussions section is very limited, representing only a few generalities regarding the constituents of mango leaves.</li> <li>-the references are old. If the study is to be an "update", as stated by the authors in the Abstract, it should contain many more new bibliographic references, available after a simple search in the literature.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-the authors should not use "and" before "etc."	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bobu Livia Ionela</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</b>