

# Review of: "A Mathematical Characterisation of COVID-19 in Mauritius"

Cosimo Magazzino<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Third University of Rome

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The Abstract must report the aim of the study, the basic information on the sample (time span, countries analyzed), the empirical methodology used, the main findings, and the relevant policy implications.

Introduction and Literature Review should be split into two different sections.

The Introduction should highlight the relevance of the topic, the novelty of the results, the importance of policy implications, the sample's choice, the methodology's appropriateness, the data used, the contribution to the literature, and the limitations of the study.

The literature review is partial and incomplete, and some recent and relevant contributions should be cited and discussed: i.e., 10.1007/s11356-020-10689-0; 10.1016/j.envres.2020.110663; 10.1017/S0950268822001418; 10.1017/S095026882100248X; 10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.112241; 10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115835; 10.1186/s12903-020-01187-3.

Avoid over-citations: some authors are cited too much! A single author must be cited 5 times as a maximum!

The theoretical framework should be discussed more in detail.

The choice of methodology needs to be clearly stated and motivated.

The estimated model must be justified in light of the literature on this specific topic.

Data should be defined more clearly. It is necessary to report the exhaustive definition of the series, the measurement unit, the (eventual) transformation used, and the source. A link to the data source must be reported.

Reproducibility is not guaranteed.

Descriptive statistics are absent.

Diagnostic tests are absent.

Robustness checks are absent.

The software used should be reported.

Notes and sources for each table and figure should be revised.

The results should be discussed more in detail.

Comparisons with previous studies are absent.

Conclusions are too short.

Policy implications are weak.

Further research should be indicated.

Limitations of the study are not provided.

Proofreading by a native speaker is required.

The editing does not follow the journal's guidelines.

Some typos must be fixed.

The originality value of the study is limited.

This is a basic econometric exercise without a clear innovative intuition.

How does the paper enrich the knowledge of the scientific community?