



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6354
Title of the Manuscript:	Existence and Structure of Entire Large Positive Radial Solutions for A Class of Quasilinear Elliptic system¹
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 article is written in an erratic manner that makes it all but unreadable. The grammar is slovenly, the text contains nonsensical phrases, e.g. > Recently, J.Garcia-Melian and J.D. Rossi [13] for which existence and nonexistence > results for boundary blow-up solutions can be obtained to the elliptic system ... [system (9)] Even the main (!) system of equations is probably misrepresented in the Abstract and again in equation (1) --- namely, the second divergence term ought to have variable v (not u). Pervasive in the article are mistakes in referencing, e.g. Theorem 1 makes a reference to system (1) while it appears to make statements about system (3). The main notions such as 'explosive solutions' and 'large solutions' are not defined in the article. I do not know what may have caused this number of text editing mistakes -- perhaps the article has been mechanically or carelessly translated from the original language. Be that as it may, this referee finds it is practically impossible to assess the value of the mathematical ideas in this work.	My paper have been modified arccording to Review. Please see the correct the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--