

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_101299
Title of the Manuscript:	ON THE EXISTENCE OF A HOLLOW NEUTRON STAR
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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. The title should be revised.</p> <p>3. Average</p> <p>4. Average</p> <p>5. Okay</p> <p>6. References are sufficient but not recent.</p> <p>Apart from this more corrections are required:</p> <p>1. The present title is not appropriate. Te title should be meaningful.</p> <p>2. The previous literature taken by the author are very old, it should be revised, including the current papers.</p> <p>3. The reference numbers are started from ref no [2]. Reference no [1] is missing. This should be corrected throughout the paper.</p> <p>4. There are some grammatical mistakes appeared in the paper for example, In the conclusion part the sentence " the core due strong gravitational" and many more. All the grammatical mistakes should be corrected throughout the paper.</p> <p>5. In results the differences are found in the values of r_{in} and r_{out} from both the model NS 1 and NS 2, what is the reason behind this.</p> <p>6. From where the input data have been taken?</p> <p>7. Are there any results available for comparison? If yes please compare the same.</p> <p>8. In reference section the references are not in a similar format? It should be corrected.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some grammatical errors are there.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be revised & resubmit.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Purvee Bhardwaj
Department, University & Country	Rabindranath Tagore University, India