SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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**
It is regretful that no substantial improvement has been made in the revised version to respond my questions. 1) The subdivision rule defined by Equation (3.2) is somewhat complicated. It is beyond the need for producing symmetric subdivision schemes. I mean you have many simpler manners to design a symmetric scheme. I would like a more important reason and insightful interpretation why the authors constructed their schemes using Equation (3.2). 2) It is insufficient for a subdivision scheme only to be approximately affine-invariant. Suppose we are given a polygon P and the curve generated by your subdivision scheme is C. If P' is obtained by translating P by t, (namely all vertices of P' are gotten by moving the corresponding vertices of P by t), it is desirable that the curve generated by subdividing P' is the translation of C by t. An approximately affine-invariant scheme loses this property. It is unacceptable in CAGD. The authors explained that they did not normalize their subdivision weights due to the computational complexity. The reason is clearly implausible. This is the most important reason why I reject the paper. 3) About the curve quality, the authors did not add any discussion.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer