

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_102413
Title of the Manuscript:	Particle Origins for String Vibrations
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.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maybe. 2. Yes. 3. No. 4. No. 5. No. 6. No. <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>While this paper delves into a highly intriguing topic related to string theory, it fails to deliver a cohesive, comprehensive, and detailed explanation of the methods used, the findings obtained, or the significance of the research. The use of advanced and complex concepts in the paper is commendable, but the lack of sufficient background explanation makes it nearly impossible for readers to grasp the essence of the work.</p> <p>The methodology is particularly convoluted. The mathematical constructs and equations presented are not elaborated upon, and the steps followed to arrive at them are not explained, making it difficult for readers to understand how the results were reached. Furthermore, there seems to be a lack of context or clarity as to how these equations correlate to the objective of the paper, i.e., the origin of particles.</p> <p>The conclusions section provides no substantive discussion of the results or implications of the findings. It is rather abrupt and doesn't offer a meaningful interpretation of the results obtained. This makes it challenging to comprehend the implications of the research or its contribution to the field of string theory.</p> <p>The references mentioned do not seem to provide adequate justification or support for the arguments made in the paper. There is a clear need for more references to existing research in the field to provide context for the research and to substantiate the arguments made.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English language quality of the article is not up to par for scholarly communications. There are several instances where the sentence structure and phrasing make it difficult to discern the author's intent. Many parts of the text are dense and unclear, lacking the necessary clarity and precision required for academic writing. Proper transitions and explanations are also lacking, making the narrative hard to follow. A professional language editing service may be beneficial to enhance the readability of the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Xingsi Xue
Department, University & Country	Fujian University of Technology, China