



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_34591
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling and Simulation of the Population Dynamics of Snails Biomphalaria tenagophila, in Tres Palmeras, Salta, Argentina
Type of Article:	Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Comments on the Revised Manuscript Unfortunately, the models in the revised paper still do not appear appropriate and are still not clearly explained. (1) It is not clear why logistic model (2.1) for the total number of accumulated snails is used. (2) The stochastic model (2.8) is not biologically meaningful. There is no justification that the addition of a noise term ΔZ to a deterministic equation produces a biologically-realistic stochastic model. (3) It is not clear why $E(X(t + \Delta t) - X(t)) = 0$ to obtain equation (2.9). (4) The equations, the results, and the figures are poorly presented and explained.	We insisted 1 the reviewer has changed their review criteria, now asks us for changes that we did not request the first time. 2 A conclusion addressed after analyzing the data with the simplest models in modeling our conclusion is to propose a non-constant capacity. What does the reviewer suggest? Let us change from constant input to variable (K (t)). This goes against the principles of modeling: start with simple models and seek the refinement of them. It proposes a reference with theoretical model that for these real data does not make sense, would mean to change almost all the work. 3 It does not clarify why the proposed model has no biological meaning. 4 The reviewer states that a part that is not clear to him; To us if, because $E(X(t)) = E(X(t+h))$, further details can be found in the mentioned reference (Renshaw), as we indicated.