



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11394
Title of the Manuscript:	Generalized Theoretical Criteria for Annihilation of HIV-1 Virions During HAART
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	The authors formulated the complicated deterministic nonlinear dynamics of HIV-1 AIDS equations and they analyzed existence and stability of some equilibria of the proposed model. Mathematical analysis is just coarse. For example, Theorem 5.4, condition (i) ensures existence of E_3 , and condition (ii) ensures its local stability. The authors did not actually obtain the conditions under which the equilibrium is feasible and local stable. Moreover, the majority of the manuscript is quite similar to their published work ([19] and others), but they did not discuss the difference between this manuscript and those published work. The manuscript is not well written.	The paper has been rewritten thoroughly and the errors have been corrected. In particular, Theorem 5.4 has been reconstructed more elegantly. We have also explained the relationship between this paper and previously published ones. In particular, this paper is much more detailed and is a generalization of the previous paper on HAART.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) Some notations (say, $\hat{x}_1$, $\hat{x}_5$) are used earlier than they are defined. (2) The second equation of (6.4) is not correct;	These errors have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I do not recommend this manuscript	