



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_8110
Title of the Manuscript:	The Roles of Condition Number in Least Squares Equation
Type of the 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 investigates the roles of the condition number in least-squares equation. Some theoretical evidences are provided and verified. However, the abstract is not emphasized compactly to show the motivation of the proposed work. Similarly, in numerical examples, the advantages or the Contribution of the theoretical results is not highlighted in the current state.	Ok this has been taken note of.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In line 42, the dimension of Y should correct as m by 1. 2. In line 62, the last term of equation (1.2), matrix T^T should correct as pseudo inverse matrix T^+. 3. In line 69, the statement is unclear. 4. In line 73, the parameter p should be defined. 5. In lines 79~83, the description of Sections 5 and 6 should be included to meet the completeness. 6. I line 101, the wording "equation (2.2)" is suggested to be consistent with other equation representation. 7. In line 130, what is the definition of B? 8. In line 182, $b(p)$ is belong to R^m not R^n. 9. The format of references [3] and [12] is different from the others.	corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my personal opinion, the authors have to focus on the main contribution of the proposed work.	