

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_115928
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Mathematical Model for Diarrhea in the Presence of Vaccine and Treatment
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  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.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>This type of model is very important for scientific community although the topic and the similar mathematical model is very common. Very simple results have been studied here. The manuscript needs to be improved by addressing the following points before consideration. Disease transformation diagram has not been explained in the manuscript. Authors are advice to do it clearly.</p> <p>No. Treatment control variable has not been used anywhere. Authors are advice to write proper title of the article.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive. Write it properly after correcting the previous points.</p> <p>There is no important without diagram and analysis of Basic reproduction number. Writing is very poor. Need more study and add more references in the introduction section. Explain the numerical results in the main manuscript. Lack of explanation in model formation section and Sensitivity analysis section.</p> <p>Without diagram and analysis of Basic reproduction number, it can't say the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>More recent study and references needed. Some suggested references link are given below: 10.4314/jasem.v25i7.2, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rico.2022.100115">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rico.2022.100115</a>, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2021.12.066">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2021.12.066</a>, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2754">https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2754</a>, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-023-09170-0">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-023-09170-0</a>.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The literature review section needs expansion or improvement and comparison with other studies need expanding. The paper needs more efforts to establish the results correctly, so I give some recent related work for literature in point 6 and also for improvement of this paper.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

Review Form 1.7

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanjoy Basu
Department, University & Country	Arignar Anna Government Arts And Science College, India