

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_74877
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of New Line Search Methods with Three-Term Hybrid Descent Method for Unconstrained Optimization Problems
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	In my opinion, the article is within the scope of Asian Research Journal of Mathematics. There are only minor corrections and some details that should be better explained in order to strengthen the presented theme, as well as its relevance.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Pag. 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In equation 1.1, IR is mentioned, but in the text it is only mentioned as R. It will be necessary to review this detail throughout the document. <p>Pag. 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "In the sentence: On the other hand, thedk is typically..." is missing a space after the word "the" <p>Pag. 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Algorithm(16), Algorithm(17) and (18) respectively." Can you please tell us if this numeration is correct or are these algorithms missing? - If possible, the author should better explain algorithms 1, 2 and 3. <p>Page 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "H2: The level set L is convex." The L should be in italic <p>Page 7 and 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Figures and tables are not mentioned in the text - In the presented table I believe that are missing some commas on certain lines <p>Page 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At point 4 the percentages of 62, 77 and 97% are mentioned. In my opinion, is missing an explanation, comparison, formula or example of how this value was arrived. - The conclusions should be a little more elaborated, explaining better the benefits of this work, if possible compared to others, and the future perspectives of it. 	
Optional/General comments		

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:	José Gabriel Lopes
Department, University & Country	Instituto Superior De Engenharia De Lisboa, Portugal