



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_9125
Title of the Manuscript:	Energy decay rate for Bresse system with nonlinear localized damping
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In Abstract is better change(p. 100): "...multiplier method." by the: using a method developed by Kormornik[1994] and Martinez[1999], providing a larger class for non-linear functions." At the end of the second paragraph(p101): "Soriano et al. (2012); Charles et al. (2013) proved the asymptotic stability for the system with indefinite damping mechanism." delete Charles et al. (2013). In paragraph(p. 101): "Soriano et al. (2014)"; Wehbe and Youssef (2010); Santos and Junior (2010) showed the asymptoti.... delete Soriano et al. (2014) and change (1.10), (1.11), (1.12) noting that all articles cited are linear or has linears localizing . Is necessary a new paragraph noting that Soriano et al . (2014) and Charles et al . (2013) were the first works with nonlinear dissipation. At the beginning of section 3(p.104), I think that here could spend some time recalling the main definitions and results he uses in his arguments. Another remark is that the paper is to short. Thus, author(s) should submit proof or proof sketch of Theorem 2.4 in p.104, and could give all the steps of how recovering (3.9) in p.106.	changed changed changed changed The proof of Theorem 2.4 is almost the same with Theorem 2.3 and Lions[21], we omit it. We have give the steps of (3.9).



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Can describe the constants C and w at Theorem 3.1? Maybe, how a observation for make the rate more explicit.	
Optional/General comments	The result shows another form for estabilization of the Bresse systems with nonlinear damping. It was firstly showed by Charles et al . (2013) . My suggestion is that the paper can be accepted after a deeply revision, following the previous remarks.	