



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_49492
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal exercise time to control glucose in type 2 diabetes
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Literature Review Section should be numbered 2, not 1.2 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 Natalia 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. Methodology should be numbered 3. 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. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This mathematical models has a compartmental... This should be corrected as follows: This mathematical models have OR This mathematical model has..... The mathematical model developed from the schematic diagram in figure 2 is given below: Correct it as Figure 2 Figure 3 to figure 5 shows that the conditions. This should be corrected as: Figure 3, Figure 4 and Figure 5 show that All figures should corrected as Figures. Check through the work The paper can be renumbered appropriately. I think it should glucose level, not levels. Check the work and effect corrections. 	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jackson Akpojaro
Department, University & Country	University of Africa, Toru-Orua, Bayelsa State, Nigeria