

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_96077
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Compact Stars with Buchdahl Potential in 5-D Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet Gravity
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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript submitted to this journal entitled " Study of Compact Stars with Buchdahl Potential in 5-D Einstein-Gauss-Bonnet Gravity " is an interesting topic for publication. But the authors need to make some minor revisions, which is given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The topic of the manuscript is interesting and important for the scientific community. Dealing with this topic is very interesting and exciting and has a high scientific level and also is acceptable to the scientific community. 2) I suggest you write the title more scientifically and attractively. 3) The abstract section is very short and the contents are not arranged and the conclusion is not clearly reported. It is necessary to write a more comprehensive abstract. 4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5) The manuscript is scientifically acceptable. 6) In the manuscript, it is better to use newer references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No. The manuscript should be corrected in terms of native English grammar. Also, more specialized words and terms should be used in the text.</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:	Maziar Naderi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran