



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
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>)

**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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The literature review is very poor, please use recent literatures materials.</li> <li>2. Highlight the uniqueness for the study</li> <li>3. Results discussion should more deeper with relevant application.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The literature review is adequate, considering the fact that most of the reviewed materials are relatively recent, however this has been beefed up.</li> <li>(2) The uniqueness of the study is in the proposed model which aptly depict the dynamics of the disease and prevailing situation as regards current measures to contain the spread of the disease. This is the essence of the entire paper.</li> <li>(3) The results are adequately discussed based on findings from our simulations without making any spurious inference.</li> <li>(4) Nevertheless, the paper has been thoroughly revised and it is much better than earlier version. Obviously, this would have addressed comments raised by the reviewer.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	