



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_24322
Title of the Manuscript:	SIXTH-ORDER SELF-STARTING INITIAL VALUE SOLVER
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I found the paper interesting. However, the performance of the method was tested only in two (and not three, as stated in Section 4, line 91) very simple illustrative examples (two basic linear initial value problems). In my opinion the method should be tested in other general cases, such as nonlinear ordinary differential systems ($y \in \mathbb{R}^n$). Otherwise it is not possible to conclude that the method will always perform better than the methods previously published in the literature. In summary, testing the performance of the method by applying it to solve, at least, a nonlinear initial value problem would be appreciated.	
Minor REVISION comments	The paper needs some corrections. Here are some examples: - equation (3) is not correct. Authors should have written $y''(x)$ instead of $y(x)$; - [Section 4, line 91] authors stated that the efficiency of the method will be tested in three different problems, but only two problems are addressed; - [Section 4, line 97] Authors should have written "Example 1" instead of "Example 2".	I quite appreciate your observation and contribution. Equation (3) has been corrected. The third example has been added and other suggestions have been taken into consideration.
Optional/General comments		