



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_8185
Title of the Manuscript:	Free divisors versus stability and coincidence thresholds
Type of the Article	Short 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	It seems to me that in Example 3.5 the last claim "since $\text{sat}(J_f) = 0$ " should be changed into "since $\text{sat}(J_f)$ is not zero."	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Example 3.6 can be discarded as it is not relevant to the subject of this paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer