



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17068
Title of the Manuscript:	A refinement of Jensen's inequality via superquadratic functions
Type of the Article	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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Abstract needs to be improved upon because the author's considered all cases of $\alpha+\beta$ for 2^n. 2. On page 101, the author need to be more specific by mentioning the specific result in [1] where inequality (1.3) was proved to be equivalent to definition 1.1. 3. The title of proposition 1.1 and 1.2 in section 1 should be removed completely, since the propositions were repeted under section 2 (inequality 1.6 and 1.7 appeared twice). 4. The author's refered to definition (B) that does not exist in the manuscript. The clarification is neccessary. 5. The Proposition 1.1 and 1.2 is the main results of the manuscript then it should only appear under main result and not under introduction. Hence, Proposition 1.1 and 1.2 must be removed from the introduction. 6. The Proposition 1.1 and 1.2 that appeared under section 2 and should be changed to Proposition 2.1 and 2.2. 7. The paper rested on the unknown pivot (Mid-Convex). The meaning of Mid-Convex is not clearly written. Hence , the definition must be clearly stated in the manuscript. 8. Equation numbering are not tally, at all, with section at which they appeared.	1. Thank you for these wonderful comments. I have modifeid the Abstract according to your suggestion. 2. I have added the specific result in [1] and in [4] that proves the equivalence of inequality (1.3) and definition (1.1). 3. I have made those correction accordingly. 4. The definition (B) was supposed to be deinition (1.2), the correction has been made. 5. The Propositions 1.1 and 1.2 have been removed as suggested and now appears under the section of the Main results. The propostions 1.1 and 1.2 now reads propositions 2.1 and 2.2 respectively. 7. I have added the definition and some related theorems of Mid-Convexity to the paper as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		8. I have done the equation numbering well to correspond to the sections in which they appear.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		