

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.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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. I found this study interesting and relevant in the field. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p> <p>2. This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and very interesting, but ideally a good title is one that has/shows: [a] topical substance, [b] research context, [c] describing research methods, [d] value & originality.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite good but has not been equipped with the purpose of the research conducted, b. The research method used, c. The main findings or results of the research, d. Originality and value of the research conducted, e. Implications of the studies conducted. A good abstract usually provides information for the reader to retrieve decision whether he needs to read or not the entire contents of the paper.</p> <p>4. I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are good enough and appropriate.</p> <p>5. This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study and the, the methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Not all references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Textbook, Conference proceedings, and Journals. I didn't find reference number 8 cited in this manuscript.</p> <p>SPECIAL COMMENT This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study and the, have all been well and clearly stated. The methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct. Not all references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Textbook, Proceedings (Conference Article) and Journals. I didn't find reference number 8 cited in this manuscript. I think the reference quite enough for a Original Research Article (total 38 articles). I suggest that the author writes suggestions for further research and acknowledgments to related parties at the end of the manuscript and kindly cite reference number 8. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Good enough	
Optional/General comments	Accept with very Minor Revision	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Suryo Utomo
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Energy Conversion and Conservation, Indonesia