



PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_3736
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Class of Odd-point Ternary Non-Stationary Schemes

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Though the present version of the paper is certainly better than the previous one I still see several problems that should be solved before publishing the paper. There are several English mistakes (in particular in the introduction) The notation of sequences at page 1 is still different form the rest of the paper Could you explain why there is a need of perturbation of expressions (2.4) and (2.7)? In my opinion it is still not clear how the construction of the authors is related to the Lagrange interpolation (via (2.8)?) Instead of a numerical comparison of generation of conics why the authors do not use the results in reference [21]? Please, do it as it would be a precise analysis of the capability of the scheme to reproduce conics In the comparison section I dont understand the meaning of the function in (4.1): why do you need the norm if $\max\{f^k_i\}$ and $\min\{f^k_i\}$ are numbers? Also, in the line following (4.1) what is the definition of f^k_i (control points generated by the process or points on the ellipse?) Moreover, why do you need to specify a and b in (4.2)?	Introduction has been revised and modified to eliminate grammatical and English mistakes. The standard notation of a sequence of control points has been adopted throughout the manuscript. To obtain the trigonometric Lagrange polynomial we need perturbation of expressions (2.4) and (2.7). Analytic proof of reproduction conic is our future work. Norm has been replaced with mod function. f^k_i are the control points generated by the subdivision process. One can take other than specified values of a and b.