



**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:	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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"> <li>The reference numbers are lacking in Reference. Reviewer and readers cannot check evidences in the text.</li> <li>In Introduction, the authors should point out the literature review on the related field but the authors' studies.</li> <li>Lines 51-52. Disease free equilibrium point is incorrect.</li> <li>Lines 57-58. The determination of J does not coincide with the formula (2); the multiple factors are lacking.</li> <li>Theorem 1. The proof is meaningless because the disease free equilibrium point is incorrect.</li> <li>Lines 113-115. Table The contribution of sigma &amp; tau on R0 do not come from the formula in line 113.</li> <li>Lines 122-124. The reproduction number does not depend on the initial values.</li> <li>Lines 124-127. The claims are obvious from a view of R0.</li> <li>Lines 127-128. In actually, when the reproduction number becomes slightly below 1, they doubt whether anthrax infection will be eradicated.</li> <li>The reviewer conceives that there are no proper discussions in the text.</li> <li>English expression should be polished. The manuscript should be checked by native speakers.</li> </ol>	<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&lt;1 disease will be eradicated Graphs to show model is tested provided Manuscript checked</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 22-27. The foggiest descriptions,</li> <li>Lines 28-31. The foggiest descriptions,</li> <li>Lines 140, 148, 153,162, 170, 181. Incomplete bibliography.</li> </ol>	<p>Clarity made Clarity made Bibliography corrected</p>
<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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	