



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30928
Title of the Manuscript:	Semilocal Convergence Newton Method Applied to Kepler Equation: New Results
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) The Authors should not cite references, equations, tables in abstract. 2) On page 101, there is a long duplicate text. This text should be removed from "The idea of this paper...." to "equation (1.4). 3) The numbering of the equations must be redone. 4) A good literature review should be done by situating the reader of what has already been done, the results obtained to make clear what will be done in this work. 5) A new section should be made to explain the theorems that are loose in the text. They are not quoted in the text. There are unknowns, as a, b, beta and gamma, that are not explained as they are obtained or are given. 6) In section 3, the tables are exposed without any quotation and/or explanation. The results should be commented on whether the orbits are highly eccentric or not. This part is very poor and is the main part of the work! 7) These comments appear as a conclusion. 8) The conclusion section needs to be further explored as well.	The authors agree with the reviewer, so we have made the suggested improvements
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The word "y" is "and". 2) Table 1 exceeds page formatting limits.	The authors agree with the reviewer, so we have made the suggested improvements
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		