

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_87547
Title of the Manuscript:	ON COMPACT STEEP SPECTRUM RADIO QUASARS/GALAXIES AND YOUTH SCENARIO
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.journaliaari.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Comments: Thank you for your invitation to review the manuscript entitles "ON COMPACT STEEP SPECTRUM RADIO QUASARS/GALAXIES AND YOUTH SCENARIO". In this study, using linear regression analysis, some differences were analyzed in the two subclasses of compact steep spectrum sources (the CSS quasars and the CSS radio galaxies). However, the following issues can further improve the quality of this review before publication in International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal.</p> <p>Comments to the authors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The introduction is well written and covers all aspects of the study. However, there are a few issues that should be mentioned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I suggest the author include some studies in general on linear size evolution, some recent literature can greatly enrich the content of this MS for broad readers.</li> <li>- The main contribution of the paper should be highlighted and emphasized. It would be great if the drawbacks and gaps of literature are clear and, particularly, how the proposed approach aims at filling these gaps.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2- I suggest to better analyze the changes in the scatter plot of linear size against redshift, it is better to summarize both the CSS quasars and the CSS radio galaxies into one figure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I recommend including the scatter plot of source observed linear sizes against observed luminosities for the CSS quasars and the CSS radio galaxies in one figure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3- I suggest the authors need to add a table of comparison between the CSS quasars and the CSS radio galaxies evolution parameters.</li> <li>4- The authors simply describe their Results, but an interpretation of facts the reader is not enough to find. This part of the MS should be enriched with more and deep interpretation</li> <li>5- The authors should add some related diagrams (including curve fitting) and explain why inconsistencies in the results obtained from D-P / z data for quasars and D-P / z data for galaxies have possible consequences.</li> <li>6- There are some grammatical errors and typos that should be corrected before publication.</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Z. Kiamehr</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chabahar Maritime University, Iran</b>