



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_22823
Title of the Manuscript:	Approximate Analytic Solutions of the Inverse Cubic Truly Nonlinear Oscillator by Iterative Method
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	- In line 23 the expression ". . . is always not possible" should be rewritten as "... is not always possible". - Sentence in lines 28- 29 "The parameters are of the parameter " is not clear with regard to parameter in which expansion in power series is performed. - In line 56 should say "Hu and Tang (2006)" instead "Hu (2006), Tang (2006)". - Line 61 is similar to what happens in line 56 but now with reference Lim and Hu. - Reference in line 179-181 seems not have been mentioned along the whole manuscript. - In the last paragraph of Conclusions, lines 156-158, the sentence stated there, I do not know why authors say so. It is no clear, at least there are not evident reasons, to affirm that this work can be used as a paradigm. Consequently I recommend remove the whole paragraph.	Thank you very much for your valuable comments and suggestions. In line 23: 'is always not possible' has been replaced by 'is not always possible' in the revised manuscript. Please see the reference 'Rahman <i>et al</i> (2011)' In line 56: 'Hu (2006), Tang (2006) ' has been replaced by 'Hu and Tang (2006) ' in the revised manuscript. In line 61: 'Lim (2002), Hu (2002) ' has been replaced by 'Lim and Hu (2002) ' in the revised manuscript. The reference was mentioned in line 56 of the manuscript. The mention paragraph has been removed from the revised manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Very good and complete Introduction, wide list of references, and perfect formal arguments.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors should mention why, particular reasons, the study of inverse is performed in this research and no other function.	