



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_23421
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling Influence of two dominant tribal coalitions in Kenya Presidential politics
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	1 Title of the article can be more specific. 2 There are many grammatical and typographical errors (e.g. in various sentences full stops and commas are not at the appropriate places and NARC should be written in caps, the last sentence of the first page) in this regard, author must revise the manuscript very carefully. 3 Author has not given the equilibrium points explicitly and their numerical values as per the simplification. Comparison of graphical results with the analytical results is not clear (validation of mathematical results is not done in the detailed and organized way). 4 Is there any need of manipulating the upper bound of the system and making it further large? As per the	➤ Comment 1: Title of paper made more specific ➤ Comment 2: Grammatical errors improved ➤ Comment 3: The system exhibited possibility of multiple ethnic bloc equilibrium points using Mathematica software which was not tractable mathematically. Comparison of analytical stability coalition free equilibrium point results and corresponding numerical results was carried out. ➤ Comment 4: Rectified. ➤ Comment 5: Conclusion was supplemented.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	simplification it should be $\frac{\pi}{\rho + \omega + \mu}$. Pl give the clarification. The results must also be compared in detail with the results of the other studies using the same data to understand novelty of the proposed work. 5 Conclusion part is not strongly written, looks like a summary of the findings.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The articles cited in the paper and the reference section is not same. Both parts must be checked carefully.	➤ Reference updated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Area of the research is interesting and can further be developed.	