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 author needs to indicate for which functions u, v are the conditions H3 and H5 valid. For example, if H5 is required to hold for all nonnegative, non-decreasing u then (assume N=2) if f(u) is u to a positive power that is not 1, then no such function j exists since it is easy to prove that the left side inequality would force j to be identically zero. Theorem 2 appears to be a mere corollary to Theorem 1. The author needs to give a good reason to give it at all, except to say that the results of Theorem 1 show that system (2) has a solution. The statement of H2 is confusing. The author needs to rearrange the wording because the "Thus" right after (11) makes it appear that the H2 ends with inequality (11). Corollary 2.5 cannot be true as stated since it requires j(r) to blow up at R so the given equation cannot have a solution for r>R. Equations (31) and (32) are the same equation so the author needs to get rid of one of them or change something. Also in the sentence just after (32) the author writes that η satisfies (9), which cannot be. In the displayed equation at the top of p. 11, the author has f(s) and g(s) in the integrand, but those should be	

	f(ℓ(s)) and g(ℓ(s)). IN (36) and (37) the author needs to replace f and g with F and G, respectively. In the middle of p. 12, the author says "We substitute these into (42) and (43)..." but this will not give what is needed. The author means, I think, to use (38) and (39). The two displayed inequalities just before (44) have the inequalities reversed from what they should be. In the proof of Theorem 3, the author twice cites Lemma 7; there is no Lemma 7. The author never uses, so far as I can tell, Lemma 2.3 which is simply quoted from [13]. It needs to be removed from the paper. References [4] and [11] are the same paper. References [7] and [14] are the same paper. References [8] and [19] are the same paper. Reference [7] has an error in the title. Reference [13] and [16] have the name "Garcia" misspelled. Reference [17] does not have the complete title for that article	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	In the introduction, the author needs to indicate that the results from [19] given at the bottom of p. 2 and from [15] given at the top of p. 3 have conditions; e.g., the results from [19] apply only for $\alpha \leq 1$and $\beta \leq 1$. The limits of the integrals given in (12), (13), (14), and (15) should be written simply with the upper integration limit as ∞ since this is standard. At least twice the author uses the term "explosive" instead of "large" as used in the title and elsewhere.	
Optional/General comments	The author has a rather long proof of Lemma 2.2 which is not necessary; it really should be shortened.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer