



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17907
Title of the Manuscript:	UNIQUENESS OF q -DIFFERENCE ON SHARING ONE VALUE
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		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Referee report concerning Article 2015 – BJMCS – 17907 Uniqueness of q-difference on sharing one value submitted to British Journal of Mathematics Computer Science . Uniqueness of meromorphic functions is an important topic these days, and many interesting and profound results have been obtained. However, the q-difference analogues of uniqueness of meromorphic functions has been appeared only in last decade. In this paper, Based on the results obtained by Nevanlinna and Liu, the authors consider the uniqueness of two q-difference polynomials sharing one value CM or IM, and obtain some results. Results are new and interesting, and the proofs are right. Therefore, I would like to recommend this article to be published in Bulletin of the Iranian Mathematical Society after minor essential revisions. Here, some detailed comments are listed: 1. From the proofs of Theorems, we note that Theorem 1.3 and 1.4 are more important than Theorem 1.1 and 1.2. Please rearrange them. Furthermore, we can find that (1.2) holds in Theorem 1.2 and 1.4 for any $b \in \mathbb{C}$, please check them. 2. Some references, such as [3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16] are mentioned, but others cannot be noted. Please note them or delete them. 3. Page 1, ↓, line 14, References [6, 13] are not belong to Nevanlinna value distribution theory of meromorphic functions. 4. Page 3, ↑, line 8 – line 18, the notations are confused. Whether do you simplify them? 5. Page 4, ↓, line 3, which reference does Lemma 2.5 come? Why do you prove it again? 6. From Page 4, ↑, line 6 to page 5, ↓, line 12, please make them clear. 7. Page 6, ↑, line 6, “Proof of Theorem 1.4” should be “Proof of Theorem 1.3”, ↑, line 2, “which” should be “and so”. 8. Page 6, ↑, line 1, “Theorem 1.2” should be “Proof of Theorem 1.4”. 9. Please check the language in whole.	Thank you very much 1. We change “similar” into “more important” in the sentence that is under the theorem (1.2). 2. We have adjusted the order of all references in this paper and moved the others according to your valuable comments. 3. We change “[4, 6, 13]” into “[4]”. 4. Yes, we have removed some repeated words and integrated some sentences. 5. The Lemma 2.5 comes from SHARED VALUES OF DIFFERENTIAL POLYNOMIALS of J.L.Zhang which has been investigated. We prove it again in order to help the readers better understand. 6. We do this, according to your valuable comments. 7. We change “proof of Theorem
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		1.4” into “proof of Theorem 1.3” on page 6, ↑ ,line6 and change “which” into “and so” ↑ ,line2. 8 We change “Theorem 1.2” into “proof ofTheorem1.4” . 9.We have changed some sentences ,according to your valuable comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		