

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_105277
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ANTI-GRAVITATIONAL FORCE (F)
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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript submitted to this journal entitled " THE ANTI-GRAVITATIONAL FORCE (F) " is an interesting topic for publication. But the authors need to make some minor revisions, which is given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2) The title of the manuscript is vague and incomprehensible and needs to be corrected. 3) The abstract section is incoherent and needs to be written in a more appropriate format and logical framework. 4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript aren't appropriate. 5) The manuscript is scientifically acceptable. 6) It is better to use more and newer references. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>- Yes. The manuscript is suitable in terms of native English grammar.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>-The abstract section needs correction. It should be written more simply and coherently. -The introduction section needs to be revised and more explanation about the principles and concepts should be mentioned. -The conclusion section is poorly written and should be revised and corrected.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maziar Naderi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran