



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17157
Title of the Manuscript:	APPR OXIMATION OF HIGHER-ORDER SINGULAR INITIAL AND BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS BY ITERATIVE DECOMPOSITION AND BERNSTEIN POLYNOMIAL METHODS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	1) The paper constructs an Iterative Decomposition Method (IDM) and a Bernstein Polynomial Method (BPM); and applies both methods to numerical examples. However, it is not proven that the methods converge. Also the stability of the methods is not discussed. 2) The last sentence on page 1: "Another great contribution to the study resulted in the singular boundary value problem; ..." is not clear. It should probably be rephrased. 3) Listed keywords include exponentially fitted. However, I don't understand why exponentially fitted should be a key word, considering that it is neither discussed nor does it affect the results of the paper. 4) Ψ_1 equation (3.3.10) and Ψ_2 equation (3.3.12) have not been defined	This is done by comparing results obtained with analytical solutions. And the concluded that the method used is suitable to handle the type of problems discussed This has been corrected in the body of the paper. This has been corrected in the body of the paper The corrections are made in the body of the paper



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The paper needs some editing and consistency with the use of upper letters throughout the paper. 2) Definition 1.1 is not necessary 3) Definition 1.3 is not clear and should be rephrased 4) Definition 1.4 is incomplete 5) There are redundancies in the paper especially between the introduction and the literature review sections. 6) Paragraph four in section 2 needs to be rephrased. 7) First sentence in section 3.2 needs editing 8) y_2 and y_3 right before remark 3 contain the variable "E" that has not been defined.	The paper has been edited. This has been removed This has been corrected in the body of the paper Definition 1.4 now changed to definition 1.3 and it has been corrected This has been modified in the body of the paper This has been corrected in the body of the paper This has been done in the paper This is done in the body of the paper
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1) The reference should follow journal format. 2) Systems of higher order should be included 3) It is not clear how the numerical examples presented compare to the ones existing literature	This is done No, I disagree here. The title is very clear and not for system of higher orders. Since most of the problems solved with the proposed methods produced the exact solutions, there no need for much comparison This has been done in the paper