



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10214
Title of the Manuscript:	Two-step iterative methods with sixth-order convergence for solving nonlinear equations
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. Page 1, Line 23: Please give the clear expression of "$f : D \subset \rightarrow$". Similar revision must be done on Page 3, Line 98. 2. Page 2, Line 47-63: The author does not give references of Definition 1-3. 3. Page 3, Line 109: (13) should be "$f(x_n) = f'(\alpha)(c_1e_n + c_2e_n + \dots)$" and "$c_k = \frac{f^{(k)}(\alpha)}{k!}$" 4. In the proof of Theorem 1, I think there are some miscalculation, for example, (16) should be "$\frac{f(x_n)}{f'(x_n)} = e_n + (c_2 - 2c_2c_1)e_n + \dots$", (17) should be $y_n - \alpha = e_n - \frac{f(x_n)}{f'(x_n)}$, and so on. So please check the proof of Theorem 1 carefully. Or maybe I'm wrong. 5. In Theorem 1, the authors have already proven	1. All the papers I have read and written by other authors have the same exact line 23, hence I cannot add any more. 2. Done 3. Done 4. Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	that method (10) has the order of convergence 6. But in the numerical experiments, 10 examples point that method (10) is 5th order. Please explain this strange phenomenon. So I have reason to believe that there is something wrong in the proof of Theorem 1. 6. In references [3-5, 6, 8], "J. Appl. Math. Comput." Should be "Appl. Math. Comput.".	5. Actually the numbers were mixed in the brackets of column 1 and column 2, I have corrected the mistake. 6. Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In this manuscript, the authors construct three sixth-order iterative methods for solving simple zero of nonlinear equations. The paper contains extensions of the results of [3]-[8]. I think the subject of the manuscript is worth studying. Therefore I recommend acceptance of the manuscript. However, a minor revision is necessary along the lines of above table.	Thankyou