



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_50224</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>On the Analytical Approximation of the Nonlinear Cubic Oscillator by an Iteration Method</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 1. Abstract. Line 11 should read "This easily-calculated modified technique accelerates..."</li> <li>2. Page 2. Line 29 should read "...are the most important..."</li> <li>3. Page 2. Line 30 should read "Among them, those by Krylov.."</li> <li>4. Page 2. Line 33 should read "...considered. They have .."</li> <li>5. Page 2. The end of the first paragraph should further discuss that the new method is good or bad and in what way that it can help.</li> <li>6. Page 2. Line 35 should read "Harmonic balance (HB) method.."</li> <li>7. Page 2. Line 47 should read " parameter needs to exist."</li> <li>8. Page 2. Line 50 should read "Recently this method was used by Mickens (2010) in his book Truly Nonlinear Oscillation and before that also by Xu, 2007...."</li> <li>9. Page 2. Line 53-55 is grammatically wrong so it is hard to understand and it needs to be rewritten.</li> <li>10. Page 3. Line 60 should read "...valid for both small and large amplitude..."</li> <li>11. Page 3. Line 62. What are "some methods"? This must be clearly stated.</li> <li>12. Page 3. Line 63 should read "...which have been used..."</li> <li>13. Page 3. Line 66 should read "...for both small and large..."</li> <li>14. Page 3. Line 67 should read "...oscillation originated by R. E. Mickens in 1987. Later, Xu &amp; Cang..."</li> <li>15. Page 3. Line 68 should read "...for iteration method to calculate.."</li> <li>16. Page 3. Line 73 should read "The obtained results are compared with those by...(who, specify clearly)."</li> <li>17. Page 4. Line 91 should read "...a low order, usually the.."</li> <li>18. Page 5. Line 127 should read "In similar way, the third.."</li> <li>19. Page 5. Line 137 should read "An iteration method is developed based on that by Mickens [30]..."</li> <li>20. Page 5. Line 138 should read "...method was verified by comparing.."</li> <li>21. Page 6. Line 147 should read "...results in Table 1."</li> <li>22. Page 6. Line 152. The table should be numbered so it should read "Table 1. Comparison..."</li> <li>23. Page 6. Table 1. The errors should have the same number of significant figures.</li> <li>24. Page 7. Line 156 should read "The basic idea of...." Omit "We know".</li> <li>25. Page 7. Line 157 should read "...frequencies <math>\Omega_k</math>) that has a convergence property."</li> <li>26. Page 7. Line 172 should read "...nonlinearity. The method...."</li> <li>27. Page 7. Line 175 should read "...In this paper, the method has been..."</li> <li>28. Page 8. Conclusion. What is the conclusion about the comparison of the results? What about the errors?</li> <li>29. Page 8. Line 182. The pages should be specified.</li> <li>30. Page 8. Line 196. The pages should be specified.</li> <li>31. Page 8. Line 204. The volume must be stated.</li> <li>32. Page 9. Line 202. Only one page?</li> <li>33. Page 9. Line 233. The pages should be specified.</li> <li>34. Page 10. Line 236. The city of the publisher must be stated.</li> <li>35. Page 10. Line 251. The pages must be specified.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b><i>Pipat Chooto</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Prince of Songkla University, Thailand.</i></b>