



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7892
Title of the Manuscript:	Sine-cosine method for a class of nonlinear fourth order variant of a generalized Camassa-Holm equation
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	1. In Part 4 Discussion The highlight part ,author should state the different between the results and the conclusion of Ref. [2,9]. 2. Results (3.12) is the same with results (3.31)? (3.13) and (3.32)?.... 3. (3.32) $n - m = 22h - 1, a > 0, dk > 0, \quad (3.32)$ is right? Please examine it....	1. Our model and Ref . [9, 17] is different. 2. Results (3.12) not is the same with results (3.31). Results (3.13) not is the same with results (3.32). 3. We have revised my manuscript according to your suggestion.(see revised)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	For negative exponents case , the results can be deduced directly from the positive exponents? Please compare the (1.6) and (1.7)	For negative exponents case, the results can be deduced directly from the positive exponents. However, it is more complicated to calculate.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		