



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6371
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Existence and Nonexistence of Positive Solutions for Singular Quasilinear Elliptic Equations with Gradient Terms
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	Before even beginning to deal with the paper, let me quote some of the mistakes, imprecisions, errors in the rst few pages: Abstract: \f grows at most linearly at innity"; this is not true: if p is large, f(t) may be t2 (see assumptions (f1) and (f2)). { Page 1: \ (x) = dist(x; @) which is assumed to be nonincreasing, nonnegative and H older continuous"; nonincreasing has no meaning here (the function is dened in RN); nonnegative is true by denition of . This remark holds, of course, for the text written as is; maybe the author was giving assumptions on a(s)? { Page 2: \The function f: BR [0;+1) ! [0;+1)". Why BR and not ? { Page 2: \The main features of the paper are the presence of the convection term jrujp * 1+q combined: : "; in equation (1.1) the gradient term is jrujq. { Page 3: \The present paper is an part extension of [11, 23] to the p-Laplician equation. Our main ideas com	My paper have been modified arccording to Review. Please see the correct the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	from the paper [11, 23]."; laplacian, and come. { Page 3: There are no examples of functions a satisfying the assumptions of either Theorem 1 or Theorem 2. { Page 3: In the statement of Theorem 2, assumption (1.9) is mysterious: what does it mean that $\alpha(x)g(u) > C > 0$ has a solution"? Furthermore: adding a nonlinear gradient term, and then assuming that $\alpha < 0$, amounts to making the gradient term not interesting! { Page 4: Condition (B) of Lemma 2.2: it begins with 1, but then the constants, and the variables, only depend on , { Page 4: Why Theorem 1 follows from Proposition 1? Which are the connections between (1.1) and (3.1)? And I may continue: :: In conclusion, it is my opinion that a thoroughful revision of both the contents and the proofs has to be done before it may be considered for refereeing.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper requires a major revision	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		