



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6825
Title of the Manuscript:	On solvability of the Neumann boundary value problem for non-homogeneous biharmonic equation
Type of the Article	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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) In page 9 , Theorem 4.1 ; it seems there is a mistake in $\frac{\partial^k u}{\partial v^k} = \psi_k \quad (k = 1,2)$ the order of partial derivative must be corrected and written as $\frac{\partial^{k+1}}{\partial v^{k+1}} = \psi_k \quad (k = 1,2)$ (according to the author's notation inside the proof) and rewrite them in other applied parts in the hole of the paper (because as I see that , the authors considered the boundary condition as $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2} = \psi_1, \frac{\partial^3}{\partial v^3} = \psi_2$) . 2) To improve paper's presentation , the authors may add some sentences about " either Neumann problem for Bi-harmonic (1.5) ,(1.6) is a " correct " problem in Notherian (Fredholmian) sense ?! .	1) We agree. We have changed. 2) We agree. We added that our problem, as we proved, is correct in the sense of Fredholm.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		