

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_99675
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effects of Gravitational Wave Recoil on Black Holes
Type of the Article	Review 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I found the major issue in the manuscript is related to reference or citation, author has listed the references at the last of the manuscript but they are not mentioned inside the text. References should be written in order as it is cited inside the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the present review work, the author discussed the impact of gravitational recoil on black holes and development of the galaxy that contains the host black hole. I suggest the author submit the revised version of the manuscript. My few suggestions are listed below:</p> <p>1. This is my suggestion to write the full meaning of the term when it is used for the first time in text to make a better understanding of the general readers (who are not related to the particular field). For example the author used the term EHT (I think it means Event horizon telescope).</p> <p>2. I found the major issue in the manuscript is related to reference or citation, author has listed the references at the end of the manuscript but they are not mentioned inside the text. References should be written in order as it is cited inside the manuscript.</p> <p>3. In the introduction Section, the author should make it clear what author wants to contribute new in addition to the earlier cited works by the previous authors. It will be better to introduce at the end of the introduction section, the plans for various sections.</p> <p>4. Author mentioned the software used for solving N-body simulation in Supermassive Black holes is GADGET-2 that comes with its own disadvantages. It will be better to address the comparison of GADGET-2 and Vine, to make better understanding for readers.</p> <p>5. The conclusion section is not well written. It needs to improve.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anuj Kumar Dubey
Department, University & Country	Allenhouse Institute of Technology, India