

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_106175
Title of the Manuscript:	Sakholian radius-to-mass ratio postulate applied to the calculation of the mass or the radius of a sun's planet, of a planetary satellite and of a given star belonging to the Milky Way
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. I found this study interesting and relevant in the field. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p> <p>2. This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and very interesting, but ideally a good title is one that has/shows: [a] topical substance, [b] research context, [c] describing research methods, [d] value & originality.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite good and has been equipped with a. the purpose of the research conducted, b. The research method used, c. The main findings or results of the research, d. Originality and value of the research conducted, e. Implications of the studies conducted.</p> <p>4. I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are <i>very good</i> and <i>appropriate</i>.</p> <p>5. This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Original Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, Methodology, have all been well and clearly stated. The significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>.</p> <p>6. All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Journals, Textbook, Proceedings, and some websites with the number is very sufficient (46 references).</p> <p>SPECIAL COMMENT This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Original Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, Methodology, have all been well and clearly stated. The methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, as well as the significant findings have been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>. Analysis and Discussion has also been presented sequentially, well structured and comprehensive. All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Journals, Textbook, Proceedings (<i>Conference Article</i>), and some websites. Although some of the references used are somewhat out of date, the number is very sufficient (46 references), with a selection of related references to support the analysis and discussion in this manuscript. <i>In my opinion</i>, this manuscript has advantages in terms of a coherent way of writing (<i>background, literature review, previous studies, theoretical basis, Data Collection, Extraction and Characteristics</i>, to well-presented, clear, complete and comprehensive analysis and discussion). The analysis carried out was also <i>good, complete</i>, and the discussion was <i>clear, complete and comprehensive</i>. I believe that the author has <i>adequate understanding and knowledge</i> of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good enough</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Accept with Minor Revision</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Suryo Utomo
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Energy Conversion and Conservation, Indonesia