



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_48683
Title of the Manuscript:	Mathematical Modeling of Yellow Fever Transmission Dynamics with Multiple Control Measures.
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:

(<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	<p>The writing style of the paper is very good. This paper is well presented and organized. The authors have given sufficient details for the experiment. Overall it is a good paper.</p> <p>Some improvements are suggested</p> <p>There are a few spelling mistakes in the paper. E.g. 'bitting' is properly spelt as 'biting'</p> <p>The layout of the paper needs to be improved.</p> <p>It would be nice if the authors can include a block diagram or a UML diagram that explains their model! (the steps and the algorithm!)</p> <p>The paper needs to be reformatted according to the journal. PLEASE KINDLY REFORMAT YOUR PAPER ACCORDING TO THE JOURNAL INSTRUCTIONS</p> <p>CAN THE SIZES OF THE GRAPHS BE INCREASED! THIS WOULD MAKE THEM CLEARER TO READ</p> <p>OVERALL THE PAPER NEEDS BETTER PRESENTATION WHICH SHOULD NOT BE A PROBLEM GIVEN ALL THE WORK THAT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAPER!!!</p> <p>I have not checked the equations. Can you kindly re-check them</p> <p>This work should cite other work e.g.</p> <p>MODELING VACCINE PREVENTABLE VECTOR-BORNE INFECTIONS: YELLOW FEVER AS A CASE STUDY by SILVIA MARTORANO RAIMUNDO*et al. I.e. this paper can be included in this study. I suggest that the authors have a look at this paper.</p> <p>The authors are kindly encouraged to correct the paper as stated and reformat it according to the ARJOM layout.</p>	<p>The word "bitting" has been corrected while the entire paper has been spelt checked.</p> <p>The model schematic diagram has been included.</p> <p>The paper has been reformatted according to journal style.</p> <p>The scale of the graphs have been increased and it is now clearer.</p> <p>The suggested work by Raimundo et al has been included in the reviewed papers contained in the introduction section and it is cited appropriately</p>
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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>