

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_100994
Title of the Manuscript:	Does Mass-Gap hint the existence of new type compact objects ?
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. The manuscript is scientifically important. It is well-written, informative, interesting, and fun to read.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is acceptable. However, it can be improved to concisely summarize the manuscript. It should contain background, methods, results, and conclusions.</p> <p>4. The organization is excellent.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p> <p>7. In the abstract, does "this author" refer to the authors of this manuscript? "We" and "I" can be found throughout the manuscript. It is suggested for the authors to use a single term consistently.</p> <p>8. Fig 1 should be improved. Some text appeared behind the ladder.</p> <p>9. The conclusion section should be improved to be more concise. New reference were included in the conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The quality is acceptable. However, proofreading is strongly suggested. All errors must be corrected. For example, - "momentum" - "an strange quark star" - "uncleared"</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript provides a review and discussion on mass-gap.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Man Seng Sim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia