

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_129452
Title of the Manuscript:	Desirability of Reduced mass Concept, Conflicting CODATA Values of some Constants: Variants of Fine structure constant and Rydberg constant Equations
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In this paper, it is a good idea to work on the conflict using rest mass and reduced mass to derive variants of the equation of the Rydberg constant (R^∞), the fine structure constant, and wave number related to the Rydberg constant. The Rydberg constant (R^∞), as presented in equation (1), clearly explains the article's objective. In sections 2.3 and 2.4 of deduction concerning the fine structure constant and wave number justify the result of published work on the topics with the resulting fine structure constant's value is as appropriate to work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	okay	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	okay	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Laxmi Kant Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Chandigarh University, India