

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 '**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.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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> 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</p> <p>such as IEEE or Harvard</p> | |
| <u>Minor</u> 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</p> <p>such as IEEE or Harvard</p> | |

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? | <p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>no</p> | |
| Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript? | <p>yes</p> | |
| If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links. | | |

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

"I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

Review Form 1.6

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

| Guideline | MARKS of this manuscript |
|---|--------------------------|
| Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3) | 6 |

PART 5: Reviewer Details:

This information is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate properly.
Certificate preparation will not be possible if incomplete information is received.

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of the Reviewer | Dr. Mohammed Aboud Kadhim |
| Department of Reviewer | Electrical |
| University or Institution of Reviewer | Middle Technical University, Baghdad Iraq |
| Country of Reviewer | Baghdad Iraq |
| Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer | Ass.Prof |
| Email ID of Reviewer | makaboud@gmail.com |
| WhatsApp Number of Reviewer | |
| 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer | Wireless and Mobile Systems , CDMA, LTE ,SC-FDMA MIMO,OSTBC,OFDM,OFDMA, WiMAX, Scheduling, Networks , Antenna Design |