



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_47644
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Transmission Dynamics of Anthrax in Animal Population. A modeling Approach
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	<p>The authors studied on the compartment model. But there are many serious issues in the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference numbers are lacking in Reference. Reviewer and readers cannot check evidences in the text. 2. In Introduction, the authors should point out the literature review on the related field but the authors' studies. 3. Lines 51-52. Disease free equilibrium point is incorrect. 4. Lines 57-58. The determination of J does not coincide with the formula (2); the multiple factors are lacking. 5. Theorem 1. The proof is meaningless because the disease free equilibrium point is incorrect. 6. Lines 113-115. Table The contribution of sigma & tau on R0 do not come from the formula in line 113. 7. Lines 122-124. The reproduction number does not depend on the initial values. 8. Lines 124-127. The claims are obvious from a view of R0. 9. Lines 127-128. In actually, when the reproduction number becomes slightly below 1, they doubt whether anthrax infection will be eradicated. 10. The reviewer conceives that there are no proper discussions in the text. 11. English expression should be polished. The manuscript should be checked by native speakers. 	<p>Reference numbers provided Introduction and literature review in the related fields provided</p> <p>I disagree with reviewer. DFE in my view remain I concur with reviewer. some changes effected</p> <p>From DFE Theorem the proof has changed slightly</p> <p>Agreed sigma and tau don't contribute to R0 These are initial conditions for endemic equilibrium. R0 from published literature on baseline values R0<1 disease will be eradicated Graphs to show model is tested provided Manuscript checked</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lines 22-27. The foggiest descriptions, 2. Lines 28-31. The foggiest descriptions, 3. Lines 140, 148, 153,162, 170, 181. Incomplete bibliography. 	<p>Clarity made Clarity made Bibliography corrected</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>	