



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_46155
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Approximate Solution of Fractional Order Biological Population Model
Type of the Article	Method 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In this paper, the author(s) presented the homotopy analysis method to solve the biological population model. After reviewing, I give the comments as follows:</p> <p>1. Many methods to be studied on solutions of the biological population model and provide us the known results, the author(s) should state a lot of related content to the model in Introduction section, then this section do not appear drab and empty. The author(s) can also refer to the following references:</p> <p>① A.M.A. El-Sayed, S.Z. Rida and A.A.M. Arafa, Exact solutions of fractional-order biological population model, Commun. Theor. Phys. 52 (2009) 992-996.</p> <p>② A.A.M. Arafa, S.Z. Rida and H. Mohamed, Homotopy Analysis Method for Solving Biological Population Model, Commun. Theor. Phys. 56 (2011) 797-800, and so on.</p> <p>2. For Eq. (4.1), if the author(s) can provide the results for $a=b=1$ to the generalized biological population model, then Section 5 is become very completeness. In fact, in present paper, more attention is paid to nonlinear terms to us! But Examples 5.1 and 5.2 of Section 5 are the same as form to nonlinear terms, only the differ initial conditions, the author(s) may be give a note or remark to explain it (maybe there exist results with other initial conditions). Hence, there discusses the numerical results of the case $a=b=1$ are very necessary to biological population model.</p> <p>3. All of the equations or/and formulas should be added the correct punctuation marks, and take into account the context.</p> <p>4. Modify the formula of Line 5 in Page 4.</p> <p>5. From the Table 1, we only obtain that the absolute errors are identically vanishing, since the number value of the second and third columns in Table 1 are the same, respectively! Furthermore, the layout of Table 1 does not meet the standards of Journal.</p> <p>6. Revise the part of content of the Conclusions Section, such as "The results obtained by this method agree well with the results obtained by ADM, VIM, HPM." there is no data to compare!</p> <p>7. Replace "5 Numerical results" with "5 Numerical Results", replace "6 CONCLUSIONS" with "6 Conclusions". Modify the name form of Figure and Table.</p> <p>In view of the current situation, I recommend this paper can be considered for publication.</p>	<p>1.I listed two methods (ADM & HPTM) about solving fractional biological population model in Introduction. In order to emphasize the advantage of HAETM, i didn't state too many contents of other methods about solving fractional biological population model.</p> <p>2.It's one of the constitutive equations for $f(u)$ when $a=b=1$, leads to Malthusian law and Verhulst law. Here, we consider a more general form of $f(u)$.</p> <p>3.About punctuation marks, i need more detailed comments.</p> <p>4.About the formula of Line 5 in Page 4, i moved the plus sign to the next line.</p> <p>5.I deleted Table 1, and added Figure 2 to show the surface of Example 3.</p> <p>6.Comparing with Reference [14-22], the results obtained by this method agree well with the results obtained by other method.</p> <p>7.Titles of "Numerical Results" and "Conclusions" have been changed.</p>
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>	