



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_49492</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimal exercise time to control glucose in type 2 diabetes</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Literature Review Section should be numbered 2, not 1.2</p> <p>2. The references are not properly documented. Please check the Journal and effect corrections accordingly. For examples, see below the following. After the dates, some have , while other have not. In some Vol and No are used while some 68:1456-1467 is used.  Bergman, R-N, Phillips L-S, Cobelli C., (1981) Physiologic evaluation of factors controlling glucose tolerance in man. J. Clin. Invest. 68:1456-1467.  Brian, R-H., (2001), A Type 1 Diabetic Model,masters thesis.  Chaikivska Y.,Roman P.and Nataliia P. (2015) The Mathematical model of Glucose Dynamics in Blood over 24-Hour Period Vol. 5, No. 1.  Erica J-G. (2012), PhD Thesis, Mathematical models of mechanisms underlying long term type 2 diabetes progression, Ph. D thesis.  Frank N., Mingxian J., (2015) Mathematical modeling and simulations of the pathophysiology of type 2 diabetes mellitus.</p> <p>3. Methodology should be numbered 3.</p> <p>4. Conclusion was poorly written. What author(s) wrote in CONCLUSION is part of RESULTS/DISCUSSION. In conclusion, you briefly describe how your findings contributed to body of knowledge in this field. Therefore, the author(s) should rewrite the CONCLUSION to show how the work contributed to this field.</p>	All the corrections have been done
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. <b>This mathematical models has a compartmental...</b> This should be corrected as follows: This mathematical models have .... OR This mathematical model has.....</p> <p>2. The mathematical model developed from the schematic diagram in <b>figure 2</b> is given below: Correct it as Figure 2</p> <p>3. <b>Figure 3 to figure 5 shows that the conditions</b>. This should be corrected as: Figure 3, Figure 4 and Figure 5 show that .....</p> <p>4. All figures should corrected as Figures. Check through the work</p> <p>5. The paper can be renumbered appropriately.</p> <p>6. I think it should glucose level, not levels. Check the work and effect corrections.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		