



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7062
Title of the Manuscript:	A Strong Method for Symmetric Homogeneous Polynomial Inequalities of Degree Six in Nonnegative Real Variables
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	I recommend the articles 2013_BJMCS_7062 to be published in British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science subject to the following minor correction and revision: 1. Page 1, line -4: Separate "rewrittenin" as "rewritten in" 2. Page 4, line -1: The sentence "Notice that until now, nobody has completely proved one of them" is both unprofessional statement and an ambiguous claim. What do the author(s) mean by "nobody has completely proved one of them?" Do they mean that they were partially proved but not completely? The authors can also use expressions like "We are not aware of any published literature that presented a roof for". 3. Page 7, lines -8 and -7: The author(s) state "We will prove them in a future paper using a similar but more powerful method." I think the British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science should request the authors present those power methods here in this article. Are the author(s) short changing British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science ?	<i>I agreed with the first two comments of the reviewer and corrected the manuscript and highlighted that part in the manuscript.</i> I don't agree with the comment 3 because "that new similar but more powerful method" is focused on a limited number of inequalities and needs a distinct approach.



SDI Review Form 1.6

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