



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_16147
Title of the Manuscript:	Stability analysis of glucose insulin dynamic system using matrix Lambert W function
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper is quite well written and, in my opinion, can be published in British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science. However, I have the following remarks: • “Recently, mathematical model ...” – It is hard to say that 2006 is “recently” • “Assuming a solution form for (3.1) is assumed as ...” – the statement should be rewritten in a clearer form • All the transformations placed before the formula (3.8) should be removed as quite obvious for the readers • the statements before the formulae (3.14) and (3.15), respectively, should contain the verbs. • DDEs Corless et al., (1996). => DDEs)Corless et al., (1996)). • function lies => function which lies • The conclusions of the manuscript comes directly from the paper DELAY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS VIA THE MATRIX LAMBERT W FUNCTION AND BIFURCATION ANALYSIS: APPLICATION TO MACHINE TOOL CHATTER by Sun Yi & Patrick W. Nelson, MATHEMATICAL BIOSCIENCES http://www.mbejournal.org/ AND ENGINEERING Volume 4, Number 2, April 2007 pp. 355-368. The authors should stress the differences	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	between the results of the manuscript and the papers published earlier. • References: the authors should decide whether they give the full journal names or the abbreviations. Please clarify the ethical issues if any	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Poland