

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_77015
Title of the Manuscript:	Stark widths and shifts of Rh II in Chemically Peculiar Stars
Type of the Article	Original research paper

### **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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>First of all, I suggest the authors to re-read their own manuscript. In the process, they can find huge number of typos like "theoretical", "wavelenght", "widht". The authors refer to '<math>k = i, j</math>', and state that 'l' stands for initial... and 'f' for final. In place of 'of' they write 'if' and indefinitely many more. These exasperate from reading the manuscript. Further, the language is horribly poor. Abstract is not clear. "...from laboratories, technology to astrophysics" does not carry any sense. The construction of the last sentence is wrong.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Using simplified modified semi-empirical method, presented by Dimitrijevic and Konjevic in the 80's, authors here compute Stark broadening parameters for 31 Rh II transitions. It is simply a run-of-the-machine. However, since it is required for modelling plasma states having particular importance in astrophysics, I can still endorse it for publication in IAARJ, after substantial revision in connection with language, spelling and typos, mentioned above.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Abhik Kumar Sanyal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Of Kalyani, India</b>