

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_98449
Title of the Manuscript:	Cosmic Baby and the detection of New Compact Star- the “ Triaxial Star” : A Possibility
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:

(<https://www.journaliaarj.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Somewhat</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially.</p> <p>2. The abstract unclear please rewrite abstract</p> <p>3. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient.</p> <p>4. In this research, we need to simulate the proposed idea and prove its effectiveness and compared with traditional methods</p> <p>5. The conclusion unclear please rewrite conclusion</p> <p>6. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search</p> <p>7. Research needs to be very modern and more references</p> <p>8. The references need more arrangements such as IEEE or Harvard</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Somewhat	
<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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Aboud Kadhim
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq