



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_47644
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A modeling Approach for the Transmission Dynamics of Anthrax in animals</b>
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>)



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>This paper is generally very well written and well presented. The language used is very clear making the paper's aims understandable for a wide audience. There is evidence of results and findings in this work and a small amount of discussion and an interpretation of the findings. So in general this is good work.</p> <p>However the following improvements are suggested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Perhaps the title would be better if it reads: A modelling Approach for the Analysis of Transmission Dynamics of Anthrax in Animals.</li> <li>ii) The model that has been developed needs more clarification. I.e. even in the model section there is no information why, how and what model was chosen from a set of other models. This needs further clarification.</li> <li>iii) There is no literature review or a background research section that compares with other models and findings. This is very important</li> <li>iv) The limitations and qualities of the chosen model are not mentioned or explained!</li> <li>v) It is rather unclear how the mathematical model used was derived. Obviously the construction has been clarified. But on what basis was this particular model selected! How did the authors arrive at the conclusion to construct this model.</li> <li>vi) What software tools/ applications were used to test the model. E.g. Matlab etc?</li> <li>vii) There is no indication how the model was tested. The data given is too short to reconstruct the experiment. Perhaps a data set should be used to verify the model. This seems rather unclear.</li> <li>viii) There is no conclusion section! This is important</li> <li>ix) References are adequate / sufficient</li> </ul> <p>I have not checked the equations. Kindly have them checked out. The paper requires reediting and general improvement. More sections need to be added as stated above.</p> <p><b>Kindly improve the paper on the suggested comments.</b></p>	<p>Agreed with the reviewer to change the title</p> <p>Clarification on why, how, what on the model provided</p> <p>Literature review and background information</p> <p>Limitations and qualities of the model</p> <p>Explanation on how mathematical model was derived given</p> <p>Matlab software(odesolve) was used to test the model Results to show model was tested provided Data on endemic equilibrium and parameter baseline values provided</p> <p>Conclusion not given but recommendations made.</p>
<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)
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>