



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_22577
Title of the Manuscript:	Moments of truncated skew-t distribution applied to optimal paths
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	Abstract of manuscript is not sufficiently reliable. It does not contain a short description of the methods used, results achieved and a brief conclusion. I can recommend to the authors to add one or two keywords. Otherwise, except for some formal shortcomings, this manuscript is interesting in terms of its content and entirely appropriate for publication in the journal.	The abstract was rewritten and improved in the description of the methods used and proposed in the manuscript. Two more keywords were added. Thank you for your fruitful insights and corrections. We greatly appreciate your review of our paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No formula are numbered, sources used are missing below the figures, for example: "Source: own research". I can recommend to separate better what is the author's own contribution, and what the author has taken from other sources. Unnecessary gap is between the text of this manuscript and references. Otherwise, the paper looks very nice and it is obvious that the text of the paper is written in a mathematical editor, probably in LaTeX.	The most important formulas were numbered. The sources below the figures were partially changed. Contribution author's is mentioned in page 110 (in yellow color) before the application. Some gaps inside manuscript were edited. The text of the paper was written in LaTeX. The LaTeX files are attached to the editing of the manuscript. All corrections inside the manuscript were highlighted in yellow. Thank you for your fruitful insights and corrections. We greatly appreciate your review of our paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		