



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	The paper is based on a research, which focuses on modeling influence of two dominant tribal coalitions in Kenya presidential politics. In this context, performed analysing works and obtained findings are reported. Although the paper seems including a value, still some major revisions should be done before the paper can be published. The related revisions are indicated as follows: 1- While indicating the references, using brackets is more appropriate. The related reference usages should be corrected according to also my examples below: not (1; 2; 3; 4) → it should be [1-4] not (5) → it should be [5] not (11; 12; 3; 4; 2; 7; 13) → it should be [2-4, 7, 11-13] 2- I think there should be some more references from especially 2014, and 2015. It will improve the reference value and keep the content up-to-date. 3- While indicating the equations, it is not appropriate to use numbering like [2.4.1]. There should be a sequential numbering like (1), (2),..., (6) by not using title / sub-title numbers and brackets. 4- The organization of the content should be revised. Currently, it seems a little complex to read and follow. 5- The Conclusions section is very short. It should be rewritten by explaining about the work, its findings,	➤ Comment 1: references rectified. ➤ Comment 2: Kenya Presidential election occur after every five years, the last one was in 2013 and next will be 2017. The only secondary data available was 2013 ➤ Comment 3: Rectified ➤ Comment 4: Paper improved ➤ Comment 5: Conclusion supplemented ➤ Comment 6: Brief explanation added. Thanks for compliment



SDI Review Form 1.6

	suggestions and any possible future works. 6- Rather than writing sub-titles directly after main titles, it is better to express some about the content of the section. Thanks the author(s) for their valuable efforts to form this paper.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	