

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_85139
Title of the Manuscript:	Extragalactic Radio Quasars: Consequences of the Luminosity/Redshift Relationship
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 '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', 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.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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>I do believe that this study advances the field of research, but there are a number of points that need further clarifications to the reader's benefits. Below are these points listed in order of importance:</p> <p>1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially.</p> <p>2. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient.</p> <p>3. Both the organization and the English usage of this manuscript are unsatisfactory. Thus, it has to be further improved.</p> <p>4. Suggest to the authors to expand these explanation on their advantages and limitations. How much of losses attained due to</p> <p>5. Have a table of comparison achieved from results</p> <p>6. There must be a comparison between the previous work and present work in this paper</p> <p>7. Please rewrite conclusion</p> <p>8. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search</p> <p>9. Research needs to be very modern and more references</p> <p>10. The references need more arrangements such as IEEE or Harvard</p>	I have effected the necessary corrections.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I do believe that this study advances the field of research, but there are a number of points that need further clarifications to the reader's benefits. Below are these points listed in order of importance:</p> <p>1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially.</p> <p>2. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient.</p> <p>3. Both the organization and the English usage of this manuscript are unsatisfactory. Thus, it has to be further improved.</p> <p>4. Suggest to the authors to expand these explanation on their advantages and limitations. How much of losses attained due to</p> <p>5. Have a table of comparison achieved from results</p> <p>6. There must be a comparison between the previous work and present work in this paper</p> <p>7. Please rewrite conclusion</p> <p>8. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search</p> <p>9. Research needs to be very modern and more references</p> <p>10. The references need more arrangements such as IEEE or Harvard</p>	I have effected the necessary corrections.

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<p>I do believe that this study advances the field of research, but there are a number of points that need further clarifications to the reader's benefits. Below are these points listed in order of importance:</p> <p>1. The readability of this paper requires improving. I have difficulty following the text. The whole text should have been paragraphed properly. In the current form, the entire text appears as a big lump, impairing its readability substantially.</p> <p>2. The literature review on the recent progress for this research topic is not sufficient.</p> <p>3. Both the organization and the English usage of this manuscript are unsatisfactory. Thus, it has to be further improved.</p> <p>4. Suggest to the authors to expand these explanation on their advantages and limitations. How much of losses attained due to</p> <p>5. Have a table of comparison achieved from results</p> <p>6. There must be a comparison between the previous work and present work in this paper</p> <p>7. Please rewrite conclusion</p> <p>8. There must be a comparison between the previous work and work search</p> <p>9. Research needs to be very modern and more references</p> <p>10. The references need more arrangements such as IEEE or Harvard</p>	
---------------------------	--	--

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