

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_85417
Title of the Manuscript:	Tadpole Galaxy (UGC 10214) Morphology May be Formed by the Combination of the ROTASE Mechanism and Galactic Merging
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.journaliaarj.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Page 3, I've highlighted the hypothesis statement. I can't follow the wording. Please make that more clear. It might be beneficial to not use a rhetorical question.</p> <p>Please use more formal language in the other locations highlighted.</p> <p>The discussion around Figure 4 concerns me about the two disks. I'm not sure that from the perspective we have that these disks are in different planes. If you can justify that with a model or observation please do. I feel that this is essential to your discussion.</p> <p>For example how do you know that the two regions labelled galaxy 2 and 3 are galaxies and not part of some spiral structure. Further how do you know that they are moving as indicated.</p> <p>Same for figure 5. Are you basing the discussed motion on some observed blueshift or other motion indicator?</p> <p>In figure 5 how does the center get pulled toward two points?</p> <p>You allude to some equations</p> <p>In figure 7 and the related discussion. I agree the perspective makes this a challenge to see what is happening. But based on what is shown. I don't understand why it would stretch in this manner. If the core accelerates inward, so would the nearby stars.</p> <p>In the conclusion there is a reference to information extracted from the image of UGC 10214. I don't see that information, just conjecture.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>On Fig.1. It isn't clear which three galaxies are there. I believe the larger structure is the tadpole are there two smaller galaxies indicated. It might be beneficial to outline each to make the point more clear. I think the figure label might be better as intruder instead of galaxy 2 and compacted galaxy instead of galaxy 3.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The abstract and introduction were both helpful in setting up the context.</p> <p>Figure 9. A listing of these galaxies with some tabulated properties might be more insightful than a blurry image.</p> <p>Figure 10. The line of sight line might be more clear if it didn't go through the galaxy. The line starts within the galaxy which is not intended.</p> <p>Also Figure 10 right is the same as figure 8. Please just refer to figure 8 and remove 10 right. Or put 10 left with 8...</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Ian Bentley
Department, University & Country	Saint Mary's College, United States of America