SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	In this paper, the author consider a quasilinear elliptic equation with sigular boundary condition. By reduction to absurdity and using the upper and lower solution method, the author proved the non-existence and existence of positive solutions. But there exist some mistakes in the proof of the existence of solutions. Comments: 1. Page 5, Line 4: $\varphi_1)$ be changed to $|\varphi|_\infty=1 $, is it right? 2. Page 5, Line 6: $C_1 $ should be changed to $ c_1$, "such" --> "such that" 3. Page 5, Line 8: "Since comparison principle" --> "By comparison principle" 4. Page 6, Line 4-6: Why $\int_0^1\varphi_p^{-1}(\int_s^1 a(\tau)d\tau)=\infty$ means $\int_{\Omega_\delta}G_p^1(a(\delta(x)))dx=\infty$? 5. Page 6-7, I think the proof of Lemma 4.1 is wrong. In this lemma, The condition $\lambda<0$ is needed? If that is so, then the solution of (4.7) is not a sub-solution	

	of (4.2). But if not so, then $v_k<v_{k-1}$ since $v_1<v_0$, so the inequalities in line -5 of the proof is not right. 6. Page 8, line 16, “super-solution” → “sub-solution” Owing to the above reasons, I could not recommend the publication of the paper.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer