



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14398
Title of the Manuscript:	Information Flow in Concurrent Logic Programming
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	This paper only used the definitions and examples and I see must be used for Lemma and Proposition and proof it.	In this work, our main objective is to propose several definitions of information flow in concurrent logic programming. However, we studied and proved the existence or not of an implication between the different proposed definitions (§ 3.4, lemma 3.17). Trivial proofs were intentionally omitted. Meanwhile, we are still formally investigating the decidability and the complexity of the existence of flow relatively to the definitions proposed in concurrent logic programming.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Most of the papers used in the References for a long time ago, preferably recently papers.	The study of information flow in logic programming has not been addressed before. This explains the lack of references in the field and the presence of less recent references dealing with the foundation of propositional logic. However, in order to show the importance this concept, we added references dealing with information flow in areas other than logic.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Possible used the procedures to illustrate the examples.	We added few explanatory comments to the example 4.1.