



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11216
Title of the Manuscript:	On Continuity of Browder Type Fixed Points
Type of the Article	Research 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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1、 The problems the author puts forward a novel and Reasoning is rigorous. 2、 Reviewer did not find relevant in the field of conflict of interest. 3、 English writing appropriate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1、 Amended in writing grammar 2、 please to simplifying the process of paper	1. We have tried our best to checked the grammar of the paper. "An problem" in Remark 3.1 has been revised as "a problem". In paragraph two in Introduction, "...component of fixed points is introduced in Kinoshita (1952)" has been revised as "...component of fixed points was introduced in Kinoshita (1952)". 2. Thanks for the suggestion. The proof of Lemma 2.4 has been removed to simplify the superfluous part of the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		