

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_98708
Title of the Manuscript:	Living Body Special Mass; A new theory
Type of the 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>)

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)
Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community and for good physical activity of the modern humankind. 2. I suppose that The title Living Body Special Mass; A new theory must be corrected to give the more adequate definition of the theory. I not recommend to use the word "new" . 3. The abstract of the article is partially comprehensive. I recommend to include in the abstract the experimental results. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think that the manuscript is formally scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I recommend the Minor REVISION of the abstract and the title .	
Optional/General comments	I see the great impact of the published manuscript on the science.	

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:	Sergey V. Simonenko
Department, University & Country	V.I. Il'ichev Pacific Oceanological Institute, Far Eastern Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia