

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_97721
Title of the Manuscript:	STABILITY OF COLLINEAR LIBRATION POINTS IN THE PHOTOGRAVITAIONAL ELLIPTIC RESTRICTED THREE BODY PROBLEM (ER3BP) UNDER THE EFFECTS OF PR-DRAG FORCE AND TRIAXIAL PRIMARIES ENCLOSED BY A BELT
Type of the Article	Research

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.journaliaarj.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) 	<p>The article talks of calculating the positions of the collinear equilibrium points for the increasing values of tri-axiality coefficient. Useful for further studies and theoretical work.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable in its current form.</p> <p>The abstract could be improved. Abstract is written in first person.</p> <p>Structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>Manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Quality of the article is NOT suitable for scholarly publication. The article contains plenty of grammatical and punctuation mistakes and incorrectness.</p> <p>The abstract is written in first person.</p> <p>Spellings are inconsistent and wrong throughout the manuscript. Example: <i>Poyting-Robertson Drag is the wrong spelling.</i></p> <p>Grammatical errors need to be corrected</p> <p>Punctuation error need to be corrected throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Rohit
Department, University & Country	RVCE, India