



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_46569
Title of the Manuscript:	Two algorithms to determine the number pi (π)
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract—Add the Aim/Objective of this paper. Also highlight in the ending Lines, what experimentations are conducted and on what platform and what results are attained through this paper. Introduction: Add some Broad technical aspects with regard to the foundations of this research conducted. Add Organization of the paper after Introduction. After Introduction, add Related terms to this paper. Type Table 1 rather than Image Type the Complete Figure 2 as it contains mathematical aspects. Add Proper Algorithms of Snell's Rectification and Dorrie's Sequence. Type Figure 3 using Mathematical Equations editor Figure 4 has to be presented well. Add the platform, on what parameters and where the results are analysed and on what parameters and what assumptions. Add Objectives of this paper. Type Table 2 Check proper sequencing of the Figures and Tables in this paper Add Analysis part to this paper, after Experimentation. Conclusion to be made more elaborative and detailed. Add future scope to this paper. Add Min 25+ References and make sure, all references in proper APA style. 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Ad1. The abstract is not structured. Additional lines were added to specify main results (methods to improve accuracy, quadrature of the circle).</p> <p>Ad 2 – the paper uses Archimedes' approach and its modification – rather fundamental aspects of the mathematics.</p> <p>Ad 3- the paper is short and structured. (titled parts)</p> <p>Ad 4 - The presented experiments/calculation can be done in Excel, or a simple programming language, here the R was used.</p> <p>Ad 5 – Typed.</p> <p>Ad 6 – Typed.</p> <p>Ad 7 – Mathematical notation typed.</p> <p>Ad 8-Typed.</p> <p>Ad 9- It's now Fig 1 and 2. They show the rectification and based on this an approximation of the squaring the circle.</p> <p>Ad 10 – The presented process can be realized on any platform (including Excel). Finally they are only simple formulas.</p> <p>Ad 11 – objective stated in the abstract and later summarized. Say, we show that it's better to combine Archimedes methods as $C=a+(b-a)/3$, than $C=(a+b)/2$.</p> <p>Ad 12 – typed.</p> <p>Ad 13 – Tables/figures were re-typed and re-arranged, accordingly.</p> <p>Ad 14 – the analysis is reduced to show that the accuracy is higher for the proposed methods.</p> <p>Ad 15 – Conclusion -adjusted.</p> <p>Ad 16 – first -nobody did such study, the main results/aspect is educational - we can easily improve used/presented classical methods.</p> <p>Ad 17 – Two aspects in this paper are considered: improve the Snell method, improve the Dorie methods – both original problems are cited and described. Sure, there are many papers on the number pi as we know 22,459,157,718,361 fully verified digits of pi.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	