

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_104555
Title of the Manuscript:	Photometric search for variable stars in the field of northern open cluster NGC 1960
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript submitted to this journal entitled " <b>Photometric search for variable stars in the field of northern open cluster NGC 1960</b> " is an interesting topic for publication. But the authors need to make some <b>minor revisions</b>, which is given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The topic of this manuscript is interesting and attractive for the scientific community. This topic is very exciting and has a high scientific level and is also acceptable to the scientific community.</li> <li>2) The title of the manuscript is vague and incomprehensible and needs to be corrected.</li> <li>3) The abstract section is incoherent and needs to be written in a more appropriate format and logical framework.</li> <li>4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript aren't appropriate.</li> <li>5) The manuscript is scientifically acceptable.</li> <li>6) It is better to use more and newer references.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>- Yes. The manuscript is suitable in terms of native English grammar.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In abstract section the methodology has been mentioned. In this section, the results, discussion and conclusion should be also added.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maziar Naderi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>