



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_48545
Title of the Manuscript:	OPEN STRING UNDER THE MODIFIED BORN-INFELD FIELD
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This is a competently written, short paper that derives the momentum associated with an open string in a modified Born--Infeld field. I am a little troubled by the fact that the first page of the paper is a near verbatim copy of the introductory section of hep-th/9812219 (note that this paper is listed with an incomplete entry in the bibliography; it was also, in fact, published in Nucl. Phys.) Though I sense no unscrupulous intent, this is borderline plagiarism, which should be avoided either by rewriting this material or making it explicit that certain parts are quoted or paraphrased directly from the referenced paper.</p> <p>The paper seems to generalize Chu and Ho by investigating the case where the string endpoints are on separate branes, which yields additional terms in the equations of motion (4). I would like to see the origin of these terms, especially since the c and d coefficients are the major focus of the paper from this point on.</p> <p>The central part of the paper demonstrates the validity of the solutions for these coefficients by direct substitution. I did not check every line of these derivations; I trust the authors' competence with algebra. I appreciate the "sanity check" in the form of Remark 2.2. The key result of the paper appears to be Theorem 2.3, which yields the momentum under the special condition <math>F' = -F</math>. I would like to see what this restriction implies and why it is necessary.</p> <p>Finally, while I appreciate and admire the authors' reluctance to use too many words where equations suffice, may I recommend that some concluding remarks would appropriate, explaining briefly the significance and applicability of this result. (On that note, though I am no fan of excess verbiage, perhaps an additional introductory paragraph explaining the motivation for this work may also be worthwhile to include?)</p> <p>I hope the authors get a chance to make minor improvements in line with my remarks. Otherwise, I am happy to recommend this paper for publication.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
If plagiarism is suspected, <b>please provide related proofs or web links.</b>	As explained in my remarks, the introductory section contains near verbatim copies of text from hep-th/9812219. I do not believe that there is unscrupulous intent, but this should be addressed nonetheless.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Viktor T. Toth
Department, University & Country	Canada