



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14868
Title of the Manuscript:	A short note on weak estimation of Sharp function
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	Change the beginning of the introduction in another words, they are the same as in the paper Using the Sharp Operator for edge detection and nonlinear diffusion of the authors M. K. Ahmad, S. Didas, J. Iqbal, Dec 15 2009 The paper is not written in the style of the journal No references should be cited in the abstract	The said 2009 paper was written by one of us. Few lines of the present paper (in the beginning) are introductory and are taken from our 2009 paper. However, we have tried out level best to re-formulate it. Now, it is written in Journal's style. Yes, but it is required in this case.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References are not in the style	References are put in the style of the Journal.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Why they put x in the Definition 3.1	Because x varies over Q.