



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_16079
Title of the Manuscript:	Some New Oscillation Theorems for Second Order Difference Equations with Mixed Neutral Terms
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 <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	In the abstract, the authors claim that they "complement and improve some known results in literature". However, both in the Introduction and in the Examples section the authors make absolutely no attempt to place their results in the context of known research. There are other papers on oscillation of mixed second order neutral difference equations, for example, [12-14]. Why cannot be oscillation in Examples 4.1-4.4 established using the results of [12-14]? It is impossible to claim that "we obtained several oscillation theorems which ensure that all solutions of (1.1) or (3.10) are oscillatory, therefore our results are new".	The claim is modified in the revised paper. Further we explained that how our theorems are better with the examples than the known results.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	on Page 2, in (C3) the statement "not eventually zero for many values of n" is not mathematically exact, on lines - 3-2: either "criteria which imply" or "criterion which implies" should replace "criteria which implies". on Page 3, line 1: similarly, "the natural question arises", not "the natural question arise"; on Page 4, the first sentence in the statement of Lemma 2.3 is grammatically incorrect. on Page 4, the first sentence in the statement of Lemma 2.3 is grammatically incorrect.	This is corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is technically incorrect. The paper is quite carelessly written, see below In the statement of Lemma 2.5, "a sequence of positive real sequence" probably means "a sequence of positive real numbers". In the proof of this lemma, it is impossible to understand what $\int_{w_N}^{w_n} \frac{d_s}{s^r} ds$ means and how the author(s) obtain the last inequality, I believe, with $\sum_{s=N}^{\infty} d_s$, not $\sum_{s=N}^{\infty} d_n$ in the left-hand side. However, the statement is incorrect, see the example below. Example. Let $\gamma = \frac{3}{1}$, $j=1$ and $d_n = \frac{(n+1)^3 - n^3}{(n+1)^3} = \frac{(n+1)^2 + n(n+1) + n^2}{(n+1)^3} > \frac{1}{n+1}$. Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n+1} = \infty$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n = \infty$, in addition, $\gamma = 3 > 1$, so the conditions of Lemma 2.5 are satisfied. However, if we substitute $w_n = n^3$ into the equation, we obtain $\Delta w_n - d_n w_{n+1}^\gamma = (n+1)^3 - n^3 - \frac{(n+1)^3 - n^3}{(n+1)^3} (n+1)^3 = (n+1)^3 - ((n+1)^3 - n^3) = 0$, thus the equation has a positive solution which illustrates that Lemma 2.5 is incorrect.	Lemma 2.5 is deleted from the paper, and the results are revised accordingly.
--	--	--