



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_15152
Title of the Manuscript:	On the bounds of the expected nearest neighbor distance
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 <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	The manuscript is interesting and logically organized. Reading is clear, factually correct. I see that the main problem is that the text is too detailed and unnecessarily long. It contains very detailed derivations, which are appropriate rather into the Annex. For this reason, I recommend a considerable reduction in the text.	I have to reduce some of the steps that do not cause an imbalance in the context of the search.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	On the other hand, the manuscript has very short conclusion. Only eight lines – the number of lines is very small compared to other length of the text.	I think that the conclusion is sufficient.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		