



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_5981
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling and parameter sensitivity analysis of population dynamics in Uganda
Type of the Article	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The novelty of the paper is improved 2. The introduction is weak. 3. The author should be more explain the problem. 4. In section 2.3, $t(0)$ is t_0, similar to $t(f)$ is t_f. 5. The conclusion id brief. The results should be explained more than before.	- Each of the valuable comments raised by the reviewer has been addressed accordingly. - A few notations have been changed in the revised paper to improve its content and readability. - Overall the entire manuscript has been thoroughly revised for any typos and validity of content. - Fig. 1 has also been plotted to make it clearer and in line with the associated changes in notation in the text and notations in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		