



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_30783
Title of the Manuscript:	Generation of Checkered Patterns and Their Variations by Making Use of Eulerian Graph Features
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 (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) Introduction needs to elaborate. 2) As per author fig 3 and fig 12 are same(line 347). But as per manuscript it is not. Fig 12 needs to be corrected.	1) Revised as in the manuscript with additional references. 2) The extracted contours of Fig. 3 and Fig. 12 constitute both a bipartite graph and a region adjacency graph. So the two yellow graphs of Fig. 3 and Fig.12 are the same. But it may be confusing. So the caption of Fig. 12 and subsection 4.1 are changed as in the revised manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Grammatical mistakes in paper, unnecessary usage of semi colons(;). Example : line 657	I removed as many unnecessary semi colons (;) as possible. I tried to follow a writing style of an English writer. Probably, it was not a good emulation, if it looked bad.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	---	Changed to -- Paper style has been much improved, I think. Thank you very much.