



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_18115
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of cholera incidence by using the Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average model
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	This is an interesting research that seeks to foresee ahead of time the possible future requirements to design strategies and effective policies to combat any expected high incidence related to cholera. Nonetheless I have some questions: INTRODUCTION: 1. What is the specific motivation for Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) models for cholera incidence prediction because when it comes to forecasting, there are extensive numbers of methods and approaches available. In another words, even though the ARIMA model has been used to predict various diseases before, the motive of it application on cholera need to be addressed because diseases can have different dynamic. 2. Concerning your current objectives, I suggest that this "The aim of this study is to predict the incidence of cholera between 1995 and 2010 by the application of the ARIMA process and develop disease surveillance systems to produce high quality, long-term data necessary for the development and testing of the model". 3. The methodology seems not to match the objective of the study, that because the comparison of different models (selection of the best fit model), see table1. That needs to be mentioned in the objective. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 1. The table are not well numbered. The table 1 is "Test of Dickey-Fuller by the EIEWS software", table 2 is "Model parameters ARIMA (1, 1, 0) of the series	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of cholera”, table 3 should be “Comparison of the ARIMA models with exponential smoothing and simple regression for the series of cases of cholera” instead of “Table 1” again, table 4 should be “Models validation” instead of “Table 2”, and table 5 is “Forecast of the series of cases of cholera in the Gharb”. 2. On line 221, the author said, “In the above table, we give the forecast of the series of values of cholera in the region of Gharb”, when the table is below, and the table needs to be numbered. CONCLUSION On lines 233 and 234, the author discussed a finding like: “Other studies have concluded the effectiveness of this model on medical research, [28], and the influenza mortality of the all [29].” This should be moved to the discussion section. This finding on lines 240 and 241 “Benneyan et al., 2003 demonstrates how the control panels may be able to detect statistically significant signals in the patterns in the data more quickly than traditional statistical methods [30]” should also move to the discussion section. ABSTRACT The Conclusion section does not reflect the main objective of the study. Need to be adjusted. NB: Language errors should be identified and corrected.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Keita Mamady
Department, University & Country	Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics, Central South University, China