



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_8047
Title of the Manuscript:	Some criteria to check if a projective hypersurface is smooth or singular
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 <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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 4 from the top of page 108; i.e." In this paper..."Here, the Author I believe wanted to say something like, "In this paper, we developed a computational procedure to find at least one singular point in a given interval and to find how many of these points there are in that interval" or something like that. 2. The last paragraph on page 108 just before the references should be incorporated in the main body of the paper because it a fact not a concluding statement. 3. Otherwise, I found the mathematics and symbols used to be very correct, and I recommend that the paper be published after the Author have made the above corrections	1. This comment is useful, I have modified that statement in this spirit. 2. Second remark also fine, I moved that paragraph at the end of Introduction. Then I have added some due thanks to the referee.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		