



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10971
Title of the Manuscript:	THE MULTI-FRACTAL SPECTRUM MODEL FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF RANDOM BEHAVIOUR OF ASSETS PRICES RETURNS.
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The authors have not succeeded in using their introduction to motivate their readers. The introduction is boring. 2. Another problem with the study is that it is not clear whether the paper is a conceptual, technical or a research one 3. One cannot tell from the paper its objective(s) 4. What is the contribution of the study to knowledge? 5. There is no review of literature 6. One cannot tell the data used for analysis 7. Where are the findings of the paper? 8. The abstract of the paper needs improvement	The comments of the first reviewer are more objective and hence preferable for research improvement. However, some of the issues raised here have been taken care of (see highlighted portions of the revised manuscript).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The language of the paper should be improved	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		