



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_23421
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling 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. The paper is not well written. 2. In section Abstract, at the place of “conditions necessary” there must be “necessary conditions”. Same mistake in line 6 at page 1. 3. In the section introduction, sentence “Simulation is also carried out to confirm the analytical results.” is repeated many times. Author must use one sentence once in the paper. Remove repeated sentence in the revised manuscript. 4. Theorem 1 is wrong. The region of the solution is $D \leq \frac{\pi}{\rho + \omega + \mu}$. It must be corrected in the revised manuscript. 5. Rewrite the references according the journal. 6. Write the initial conditions with the model. 7. Rearrange the numbers of the equations and numbering of references in the introduction according to the refereed journals.	➤ Comment 1: Writing of paper improved and a table of candidates' percentage support introduced to better inform the reader. ➤ Section of comment 2 removed from the Abstract ➤ Repetitive sentence in comment 3 rectified ➤ Comment 4 rectified. ➤ Comment 5: References rewritten according to the journal. ➤ Comment 6: the initial conditions were written before numerical simulation. ➤ Comment 7: numbering of equations and referencing rectified ➤ Comment 8: Paper improved accordingly to reviewers comment



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8. The object of the paper is good but presentation of the paper is not well. It must be improve in the revised paper.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Again read paper carefully and remove grammar and spelling mistakes in the whole paper.	Grammatical and spelling mistakes rectified to my possibility
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		