



SDI Review Form 1.6

Dear Mr. Bikram Mete

	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
SCIENCEDOMAIN international	Ms_BJMCS_29890
	The series expansion of the Greens function of a differential operator with block-triangular operator potential
	Original research papers

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	The topic of the manuscript is interesting but it is not well written. The introduction is too short. Few references are mentioned. The conclusion is not appropriate. The main drawback of this manuscript is that the main contributions are not better presented. For these reasons the manuscript needs a major revision.	I take into account your notes and added an introduction, more detailed written conclusion. I know that now in many journals require a detailed report. Earlier in mathematical journals I do not write the conclusion, because all the results are formulated and proven to work. But I'm not going to dispute the requirements of the journal. Some journals do not like when the authors frequently refer to their work and that of the co-authors. They see it as self-promotion, so the original version of the manuscript I have omitted references to some of his work. Now I have expanded the list of references. Thank you for your valuable comments.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		