SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_43234**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Two Step Trigonometric Fitted Method for Numerical Solution of Initial Value Problems with Oscillating Solutions**
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)

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	If $u = wh$, kindly explain how $h = 1/320$, and $w = 1$ in Example 1.1. The same also applies to Example 1.2, one should expect $h = u/w$ from the definition. Yet in both cases, $w = 1$. Tabular results of Example 1.1 and 1.2 needs to be labelled as Table 1 and Table 2 respectively with a brief description. In your **conclusion**, rephrase *We have proposed a Twostep Trigonometrically for solving oscillatory IVPs.* Also, rephrase, *The method can complete favorably with other existing methods.* Restrict the comparative efficacy of your method to only those of Alabi and Adeniran method else you will have to include results from 'other existing methods.'	The reviewer does not have an in-depth knowledge on the topic as choice of h is at the author is arbitrary and with respect to the choice of article in camparism, however for choice of w has been included. We disagree with the reviewer as Example 1.1 and 1.2 needs to be labelled as Table 1 and Table 2 respectively. A brief description is included **Conclusion** has been rephrased *We disagree with the reviewer as the word ''some of the existing methods'' have said it all.*
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Consider plotting graphs for both results of example 1.1 and 1.2	Plotting of graph is not necessary as have the result in tables make the information clearer.

PART 2:

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	