

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_98115
Title of the Manuscript:	Some new models of anisotropic relativistic stars in linear and quadratic regime
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.journaliaari.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Please see the reviewer's comment. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) The title is suitable. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract is sufficient. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are fine. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Please see the reviewer's comment. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. After verifying some of the references, It seems that the references are relevant and sufficient. Although, I must state That there was not adequate time to conduct a review. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The author does an excellent job citing and using relevant sources (as far as I could check within time constraints) and references which appropriately expound on the author's topic. The author mentioned an important observation by the James Webb telescope which changed the formalism of galaxy formation which helps to validate the author's assertion.</p> <p>As I stated in the compulsory revision comments, the paper is laced with grammatical errors which can easily be rectified by a thorough English language check and read over. The Author does a thorough step by step derivation and explanation of the operations, mathematical components, and correlation between components of each mathematical expression. The general mathematical structure (i.e., equations, mathematical conditions, physical notions etc.) of general relativity describing the anisotropic geometry of neutron stars, quasars, and pulsars etc, are present in the paper which is good.</p> <p>Additionally, the author cites and uses relevant mathematical expressions and equations established by previously published research in respected journals. However, out of forty-five mathematic expressions (i.e., equations and inequalities), is the author's mathematical implementation of established equations correct? To be honest, with only a day to review the paper, there was not sufficient time to thoroughly verify the paper's correctness.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is laced with grammatical errors. I suggest an English language review.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edward A. Walker
Department, University & Country	Florida Memorial University, United States of America