

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
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.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	It is a good revision of the works involving Black Holes. The title is suitable and the text is articulated.  It is good to identify in the Abstract the MASSIVE BLACK HOLE as MBH, and SUPER MASSIVE BLACK HOLE as SMBH.  The formula, in the page 2, about $v_{CM}$ , must to be centralized.  It is good also to write in small paragraphs. The way that were written are so long and so tired to comprehend.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Marcos Cesar Danhoni Neves
Department, University & Country	State University of Maringá, Brazil