



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14872
Title of the Manuscript:	Feedback controls for finite time or asymptotic compensation in lumped disturbed systems
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Equation (1.1) is describing the clarity for disturbance whether it with system or input. 2. Feedback characteristic is not described here and must be state whether it is state feedback or the output feedback. 3. System matrix A is a vector or matrix with dimension it should square matrix. B is a control column vector and its described dimension is completely wrong. 4. Equation (1.4) is wrong. 5. Equation (1.5) is revealing as frequency domain randomly and the analysis is carrying out in time domain which is contrast in nature therefore conclusion will hypothetic. 6. After equation (1.5) two integral equation sum is wrong and how is zero . Describe the analysis for making zero and need of zero. The author does not have the clarity for the new idea. 7. Equation (1.6) is describing the feedback positive in nature which is highly undesirable for the system stability and not acceptable. 8. In equation (3.1) it is ambiguous that the rank of controllability or observability. 9. Proposition 3.2 is not clarifying the T. $\Lambda_T \theta$ is be drown fully which is lacking here. 10. Reference quoting is not correctly. 11. For validation simulation result is absent and simulated results must be incorporated. 12. Lacking of cohesiveness during entire papers, virtue	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of that equation symmetry is not seen.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	N/A	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	N/A	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	India