

## ReviewForm1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJR2P_96674</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>TIME STEPS DISTRIBUTION IN NUMERICAL TECHNIQUE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THIRD AND FOURTH ORDER RUNGE-KUTTA ALGORITHMS</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/editorial-policy> )

**ReviewForm1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>2. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>3. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes Yes</p> <p>Yes go</p> <p>od</p> <p>en</p> <p>ou</p> <p>gh</p> <p>go</p> <p>od</p> <p>en</p> <p>ou</p> <p>gh</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1- The oscillator treated is a Van der Pol oscillator and not a Duffing one. It needs to be corrected.</p> <p>2- Throughout the document, the authors spoke of Runge-Kutta of order 3 and 4, but in the figures it reads order 5 and 4. Which of the Runge-Kutta orders did you actually use?</p> <p>3- In terms of time series figures, the time interval seems very short to me and does not scientifically allow us to say with certainty which of the orders of RK used is the best. What would be observed over a larger time domain and a high number of integrations?</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Miwadinou Hodévèwan Clément
Department, University & Country	Université Nationale des Sciences, Technologies, Benin