

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_120508
Title of the Manuscript:	The Numerical Application of Dynamic Problems Involving Mass in Motion Governed by Higher Order Oscillatory Differential Equations
Type of the Article	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:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the challenges in solving higher-order oscillatory differential equations, which are prevalent in fields such as physics, biology, chemistry, and economics. By developing a novel one-step block method with eight partitions, the study offers a more efficient and accurate solution to these complex problems. The manuscript contributes to enhancing numerical methods, which are crucial for modeling and understanding various real-world phenomena.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "The Numerical Application of Dynamic Problems Involving Mass in Motion Governed by Higher Order Oscillatory Differential Equations," is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, a more concise alternative could be: "A Novel One-Step Block Method for Higher-Order Oscillatory Differential Equations."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from slight adjustments for clarity. It effectively summarizes the problem, the new method, and its applications. However, it could be more concise by eliminating some redundancy. For example, the last sentence could be revised to: "The new method demonstrates faster convergence and improved accuracy compared to existing solutions for second, third, and fourth-order oscillatory differential equations."</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, providing a clear progression from the introduction of the problem to the development and application of the new method. Each section logically builds on the previous one, facilitating a coherent understanding of the research.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The new method's formulation using the linear block approach is well-supported by numerical analysis to ensure essential and sufficient conditions. The approach to solving second, third, and fourth-order problems directly is a significant advancement, addressing the computational burden and time constraints associated with existing methods.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient and cover a broad range of related studies. However, to ensure the manuscript includes the latest developments in the field, it is recommended to add more recent references. Including recent articles on advancements in numerical methods for differential equations from the past two to three years would enhance the manuscript's relevance and demonstrate its alignment with current research trends.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is not suitable for scholarly communication due to several issues. There are frequent grammatical errors, such as "the new method was address" instead of "the new method addresses," which disrupts the flow and clarity of the text. Additionally, the use of awkward phrasing and unclear expressions can lead to confusion about the methods and results being discussed. These language deficiencies undermine the overall professionalism of the manuscript and could hinder its acceptance in academic circles. A thorough revision for grammar and clarity is essential to improve its readability and impact.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript effectively highlights the significance of addressing complex real-world problems through the development of a novel numerical method, which could enhance the understanding of dynamic systems in various scientific fields. • Additionally, the authors provide a clear comparison of their method's performance against existing techniques, demonstrating improved convergence and accuracy, which adds credibility to their claims and underscores the potential impact of their research. • However, the language quality is poor, with numerous grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that hinder clarity, such as "the new method was address" instead of "the new method addresses," making it difficult for readers to follow the authors' arguments. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Summiya Parveen
Department, University & Country	COER University, India