



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14237
Title of the Manuscript:	Controlled variational iteration method for Bratu equation arising in Electro-spun organic nanofibers elaboration
Type of the Article	Original 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	Authors have used the modified variation iteration method for finding the approximate solution of Bratu problem. There are several technical and typos flaws in this paper. Problem (1) is boundary value problem. Authors have transformed this problem to initial value problem (3). Problem is standard one. Results are given for a special class of the problem (3). Authors must give for the problem (3), which is nolinear. Examples are trivial. No comparisons with Homotopy and Adomian method are given. Results are not efficient.	The transformation of the boundary value problem to an initial value one is due to the fact that the considered method is generally developed to solve initial value problems. I don't understand the mean of the following referee comments "Problem is standard one. Results are given for a special class of the problem (3). Authors must give for the problem (3), which is nolinear. Examples are trivial." I believe that the comparison with other methods, especially Homotopy and Adomian method doesn't add any benefit to the topic of the paper. I don't know what is the criterion of results efficiency from the stand point of the referee?
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		