SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_44846**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Fully Implicit five-quarters Computational Algorithms of order five for Numerical Approximation of Second order IVPs in ODEs**
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** *(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 authors could consult a professional for overall proofreading of the article.**	Done accordingly
	2. Lines 31-40 should be rewritten for better understanding.	Effected
	3. Equation numbering is not well formatted (Line 60, 65, 75, 85, 106, 126, 134, 139, 142)	Has been adjusted
	4. Line 61 seems to be an incomplete sentence	The sentence continues in line 62
	5. Line 76, 'grid points' not 'grip points'	Typing error , corrected
	6. Line 114 should be 'In numerical analysis, it is important that a linear multistep method satisfies…'	Corrected
	7. Sentence in Lines 154-155 seems incomplete	Has been modified
	8. Result presentation in the tables should be improved. The values are mumbled together.	Noted
	9. Each Problem considered in Section 5 should be compared with recent work by other authors. The methods of comparison could be of equal or higher order to the new block method proposed.	Comparison has been made to authors who used the same values of h while other results will serve as basis of comparison for other researchers
	10. Conclusion should include discussions on the comparisons made based on Comment 9.	Done
	11. The reference style is not consistent.	References Corrected
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	