



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_13221
Title of the Manuscript:	Nontrivial weak solutions of a quasilinear equation involving p -Laplace operator
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Referee's report on the manuscript "Nontrivial weak solutions of a quasilinear equation involving p-Laplace operator" The paper under review studies the existence of nontrivial solutions for the following problem $-\Delta_p u + u ^{p-2}u = f(x, u); \quad x \in \Omega;$ $u = 0; \quad x \in \partial\Omega^-$ where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 3$) with smooth boundary, $1 < p < N$, f is a continuous function. After checking this paper carefully, I found that this paper is poorly written and I will point out several major problems. 1. The introduction should be rewritten. In my opinion, the authors should point out why it is needed to study this problem and the main difficulty in obtaining the main results. Moreover, the authors should renew the references to ensure the newest of this paper. Without reading the full article, readers should have a brief idea about: the problem, the past results, the results to be proven in the paper (and possible	The spelling mistakes were corrected and highlighted on manuscript. The simplicity of the results arise from the fact that the characterization of the first eigenvalue of the p-Laplace operators is well-known while the situation is very complicated for $p(x)$-Laplace operators which is not the case for this paper. Therefore, one encounters main difficulties especially when dealing with the eigenvalues of the $p(x)$-Laplace operators not for the p-Laplace operators. The main difficulties of the problems including p-Laplace operators are clearly explained in introduction. As for example, when p is not equal to 2 we lost the Hilbert structure and lost the linearity of the p-Laplace operator. These obstacles cause many difficulties when obtaining the results. Moreover, I think the references are updated and enough for the results of the present paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	assumptions), the main difficulty in obtaining the re- sults and the main tools used. However, after reading the introduction of this paper, I found little. 2. The paper should be polished in English writing since there are so many grammar errors. For example, page 1, line 10 from above, "the existence and nontrivial solutions of the following..."; page 1, line 2, 3 from below, "for nonlinearities f which do not necessarily satisfy the classical conditions"; page 2, line 3,4 from above, "The norms that make $L_p(-)$ Banach spaces are, respectively," etc. Moreover, there are some misprinting, for example, page 2, line 17 from above, "$p_\alpha = Np = N_j p$" should be "$p_\alpha = Np = (N_j p)$". Furthermore, I was told that a recent book (in Chinese) will serve the purpose: http://product.china-pub.com/3022362. This book should be a good reference for the authors. Above all I think this paper needs to be improved.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		