

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_94796
Title of the Manuscript:	Out-of-plane equilibrium points in the ER3BP with triaxial-radiating primaries with a P-R drag force surrounded by a belt
Type of the Article	Review

### 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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This study is an analytical solution of Out-of-plane equilibrium points in the ER3BP with triaxial-radiating primaries with a P-R drag force surrounded by a belt, as well. This can be considered as a solution of generalized out-of-plane equilibrium points in the frame of elliptic restricted three-body problem. Numerical Results are also logical. Results are clear. Errors obtained are acceptable. I think it may be considered in the "Physical Science International Journal".	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	1-The text format and mathematical relations is not appropriate at all. It is better to type with the tex appropriate software package, e.g. MlKTeX, TexMaker, Texlive ,...  2- It's better to additional explanation of the content, if possible, Use the appropriate figure/figures, chart and table in the manuscript .	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is suggested to comparison the related numerical results with other analytical model of generalized out-of-plane equilibrium points in the frame of elliptic restricted three-body problem. This comparison enriches the results. It is better to add comparison to the article in the form of graphs/figures.	

### 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:	Amin Najafi
Department, University & Country	Technical and Vocational University, Iran