SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJMCS_30573**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Global stability and traveling waves of an epidemic model with diffusion and latent period**
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	-	
Minor REVISION comments	Generally, this paper presents a research work in which the author(s) examine "the global stability and the existence of traveling waves for a delayed diffusive epidemic model. In this context, they extend and generalize some models and results from the literature. From a general perspective, the paper has a remarkable subject and comes with a well-designed technical structure. The performed works and the obtained results are also provided in a good focus. The author(s) should also do the following revisions: 1- Generally, it is not appropriate to use citing under the Abstract section. So, it is better to say "…main results presented in the literature are…" rather than "…main results presented in [2, 4, 6, 7] are…". 2- It is better to write [1-4] rather than [1, 2, 3, 4], for more than two consecutive references. 3- Is there any future works planned? I think it should be discussed briefly at the end. 4- I think it is better to include at least 25 references. There should also be a few recent references from 2014, 2015, and 2016, in order to improve quality of the paper and keep it up-to-date. Thanks the author(s) for their valuable efforts to form this paper.	We fixed all comments.

Optional/General comments	It would be nice if the content could be supported with some visual elements (figures including i.e. schemas, graphical presentation, flow chart).	