SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJAST_24007**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ISAC'S CONES**
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		
Optional/General comments	I have looked to the work and my opinion goes as follows. " The manuscript presents a very interesting domain of research in Nonlinear Analysis dealing with Isac cones. The manuscript is well written and deserves publication."	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Themistocles M. Rassias**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Mathematics, National Technical University of Athens, Greece**