



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-	
<u>Minor</u> 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.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Utku Kose</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Computer Sciences Application and Research Center, Usak University, Turkey</i>