



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. The writing of this paper in grammar should be improved 2. The novelty of this paper should be identified more than before. 3. Some definition should be written in the paper such as supernormal cones, weakly complete cones. 4. The introduction is very short. 5. The conclusion should be written. 6. The example can be explained more than before.	The comments by the reviewer have indeed been very useful for making further changes and extension of the manuscript. - The manuscript has been edited and thoroughly revised for grammar and typos. - There has also been a streamlining of the manuscript with respect to novelty. - I do not understand what the reviewer means here by asking for some definitions of e.g. "supernormal cones, weakly complete cones." - The introduction section has been expanded as requested by the reviewer. - After reading the conclusion section, some additions have been made basing on the results and discussions of the manuscript. It is therefore hoped that the revision will make it much more logical and clear based on the content of the paper. - An effort has been made to explain the example more than was done before.