



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17076
Title of the Manuscript:	Conditions for existence or nonexistence of positive solutions to elliptic general model
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	Throughout the paper you could use $\mathbb{R}^n$ instead of R^n. On page 3 the references can be cited like [2,4,6,7,12,13] In order to improve the English you can: rewrite the comment before Th. 1.1. and 1.2 (to Their result is the following). On page 6, 1st line change θ_a to θ_{a-x}. Theorem 3.1: change h_v to h_v.	Thank you for pointing them out. I corrected as you suggested.
Optional/General comments	The article is well written, contains clear mathematical body and well citations. The author(s) could think about modifying the title to "Conditions for (non)existence..." The author(s) could also write the 4 PDEs on page 2 in a more economical way: e.g. competition/cooperation... $\mp cu(x,t)$... (where $-$ stands for competition and $+$ for cooperation)...and finally: are the two equivalent forms really necessary? On page 6: below (5) and above Th. 3.1: Instead if "where $g, h \in C^2$..." you could write "If $g, h \in C^2$..." and declare the text to be a Proposition and then you could make a reference at the end of the proof at page 7. Throughout the paper the proof 's endings should be clearly marked (with q.e.d. or a rectangular) There are no conclusions in the paper...	I took off the equivalent form. I reorganized the conditions of the theorem. I put q.e.d. notation at the end of all proofs.