

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_80372
Title of the Manuscript:	On Size Evolution / Radiated Power of Extragalactic Radio Sources and Implication
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	<div>1. Key Words should be separated by semicolon (;) and not by comma (,) as given in the paper.</div> <div>2. MSC No. should be given after Key Words.</div>	
Minor REVISION comments	<div>3. In the Abstract, comma (,) after “conclusively” will be deleted and it will be after “Therefore”.</div> <div>4. In the Introduction Section, all the symbols should be defined. It is not always possible to go through the references mentioned in the discussion. It should be “supermassive” instead of “suppermassive” as written in the text.</div> <div>5. It is written that the relation (1) is “obtained”. The deduction is not given and it should be shown. Moreover, the reason for the neglect of the constant on RHS of equation (1) should be given. How do you get the values of regression coefficients, should be shown . It seems that the paper is written for the author only. A little more elaboration is required.</div> <div>6. In Section 3, the equations (3) and (4) are written without any calculation and derivation. The assumed approximation should be with some valid explanation and reasoning.</div> <div>7. In Section 4, the equation (6) is approximated without any reason and explanation. The reason of omitting terms should be given. Some logic should be given for losing terms. Otherwise, it seems a doubt about the strong knowledge of mathematical analysis.</div> <div>8. In Section 5, it should be “discussion” after “foregoing”. Correlation coefficient is given by 0.1.How do you get it? Is it obtained through a software or by personal calculation? If it is obtained through a software, mention the name of the Software.</div>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Is it not possible to improve the standard of observation?</p> <p>9. In Section 6, similar situation arises for approximation. Random neglect of terms is not good.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>If all the above mentioned queries are reasonably answered, the paper may be considered for publication.</p>	

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rasajit Kumar Bera
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technical Teachers' Training and Research, India