Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_94937**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Calculation of Bohr's radius of any atom on the basis of Planck constant free equation, mathematical complexities, and atomism.**
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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	**This paper can be divided into two parts. The first one is a compilation of criticisms, potential inconsistencies and some other philosophical issues regarding the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. In this part, there are many literal citations to the work of someone else (mainly to Mills. In addition, I feel that the perspective is unbalanced; a complete review should also include the success of the model.** **In the second part, the authors elaborate a simple formulation to obtain the Bohr radii in multi-electron atoms. Section 2.1 is a summary of Ghosh and Biswas' work, and it is not clear to me the connection with the remainder of the paper; for instance, is max and a_i the same quantity? Anyway, the starting point is Equation (9) as well as Equations (11) and (12). May be I am confused here, but I noted that Equation (9) is not correct because the RHS has units of velocity, whereas the LHS has units of length. On the other hand, the authors indicate that Eqs (11) and (12) were derived in reference [15], but I have checked reference [15] and I failed to find anything about this. Finally, I found some difficulties to understand Table 1. I understood that the last column (Bohr's radius #) corresponds to the values obtained by Ghosh and Biswas (2002). Is this correct? But I checked this reference and the values do not match.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**F. J. Sanchez-Salcedo**
Department, University & Country	**UNAM, Mexico**