



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_48664
Title of the Manuscript:	On the role of squared neutron number in reducing nuclear binding energy in the light of Electromagnetic, Weak and Nuclear gravitational constants – A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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>Many of the Tables (for example, Table 1 and Table 2) have information that can simply be generated using equations in the text. These redundant lengthy Tables should be abbreviated or removed. Similarly, Figure 1 is not really needed.</p> <p>Some reference to experiments should be given so that the accuracy of estimated and SEMF binding energies can be judged.</p> <p>The significance of Z=30 (Results and Discussion, point 5) should be explained. Is there something peculiar about Zinc that makes this number important?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>A reference or equation explaining the SEMF should be given on p. 11.</p> <p>References to string theory should be given to support the speculation in the Conclusions.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	English usage is acceptable but could be improved, as could quality of the presentation and figures.	

**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)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	John Clayton
Department, University & Country	University of Maryland, USA