



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_5816
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATIONS OF LOOP TREES
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 does not contain a Conclusions section. I strongly believe that such a section should be added where all the results of the paper should be briefly summarized. The Introduction section should clearly state somehow that the topics briefly presented in 1.1-1.5 are later approached in the paper (together with the section numbers where they are presented). "Chapter 1" is mentioned multiple times (lines 156, 334, 1407). It should be replaced by "Section 1".	A Conclusions section has been added to the paper and highlighted. This has now been done. See the highlighted corrections to each of the sections 1.1 through 1.5. This has now been done and highlighted.
Minor REVISION comments	Many parts of figures are surrounded by a black contour (e.g. Fig. 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, etc.). It is obvious that the contour was drawn by hand and is irregular. I would suggest to replace the hand-drawn black contour by a more regular shape (e.g. circle, ellipse, etc.), which would make the figures look better.	The IT staff at George Washington University is currently working on improving several aspects of the design of the figures in my paper. You should get the results shortly.
Optional/General comments	The paper is very strong from a technical point of view and presents many interesting results related to loop trees. It is also unexpectedly long (60 pages) – the contributions of the paper could have easily been presenter over multiple different papers. Nevertheless, despite being long, the paper is self-contained and well organized and all of its parts are well connected to each other.	The author has received permission from BJMCS to submit the revised paper as a single paper, rather than splitting it into several papers.