



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_49390
Title of the Manuscript:	EPIDEMIOLOGICAL MODEL FOR PEADIATRICS PATIENTS WITH LEPROSY INFECTION
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript will benefit from English language editing. The abstract is very difficult to read and follow and due to the poor writing as such, the abstract will have to be rewritten. Due to the poor use of English, some phrases convey the wrong information, even though a peer would be able to understand what the intended meaning was. 2. Reference should not be included in the abstract. The abstract looks like preamble to the main paper, authors should endeavor to follow the journal guidance. 3. Figure 1 is not appropriate where it was inserted. 4. Did authors take permission for using figure 1 apart from referencing their names? 5. Recent literature is not included 6. Reference are too short. There are many studies conducted on Mathematical models 7. The perspective is not too wide enough 8. The review is not sufficiently analytical 9. There is no coherence 10. Page 2, line 49-50 should be referenced 11. The schematic diagram for the mathematical model, which makes it difficult to see the link between each of the parameters 12. How would all the equation 3.1-3.5 equal zero? 13. Line 130, the equation is not right 14. If the infection Free State equals to zero, I think there is not disease to model, which makes your mathematical model erroneous. 15. Steps taken for the numerical simulation should be stated. 16. There are no results for the simulation and no application of the model to real dataset, which makes this manuscript uninteresting. 17. The Figure 2-4 are not adequately interpreted. 18. The conclusion does not support or add anything to your manuscript 	I agree with the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	