

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_77112
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing the Performance of four Sinc Methods for Numerical Indefinite Integration
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### 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	The article discussed the performance of various Sinc methods for the numerical estimation of indefinite integrals with logarithmic and algebraic end-point singularity. The new method is closely related to the method proposed by Haber and Stenger's formula and Tanaka sinc scheme. A detailed convergence of exact and numerical solutions has been shown that corroborated the theoretical deductions. The simulations revealed that the double exponential sinc method developed by Tanaka et al. is the most accurate numerical approximation. Haber's formula, which involves one single sum evaluation, had the shortest minimum CPU time.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The language needs to be revised from a grammatical point of view.</li> <li>2) Put equation number on page 2 at the place where Integral is defined.</li> <li>3) Recheck the calculations related with Eq. (2.2)</li> <li>4) In Eq. (2.6) check the bounds of <math> J </math></li> <li>5) Put all references in a consistent manner.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper may be accepted after incorporating above comments and plagiarism check.	

### 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)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Navnit Jha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Asian University, India</b>