



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_24118
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-Relativistic Bose-Einstein Condensates, Kaon droplets, and Q-Balls
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>)



SDI 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	<p>I note that this paper has been languishing on arxiv.org for more than a decade, which is surprising because although speculative, it is a decent paper that is certainly of publishable quality.</p> <p>I have one technical issue with the paper: In the 2nd paragraph after Eq. (9), the authors mention repulsion between identical \bar{d} and s quarks in the two K⁰'s: why would the quarks be identical instead of carrying opposing spins?</p>	we address all of the comments of the referees
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Some very minor comments that I hope the authors have time to address before publication:</p> <p>Introduction, 4th paragraph: BECs obtain -> BECs are obtained ibid.: This manifest -> This is manifested Forming a spatial droplet, 1st paragraph: For which potentials the -> For which potentials do the There are two equations (5)-s: (Yes, I see the (a) and (b), but it would be more appropriate to label these equations as (5a) or (5b) or just (5) and (6). Also, the formatting of the inline formulas before and after the second Eq. (5) are a bit odd (variable names not italicized). Strangeness-Beauty Balls, 2nd paragraph: as the later -> as the latter Paragraph after Eq. (11): The box diagrams [...] suggests -> suggest [subject of sentence is plural] Binding and BECs, first paragraph: Let N-bosons -> Let</p>	we address all of the comments of the referees



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>\$N\$ bosons (occurs on multiple occasions, with inconsistent typography)</p> <p>Eq. (16): Spurious exclamation mark (can be confused with factorial)</p> <p>Fig. 2: a) does not look like a cube, and b) could use some annotation on the figure to guide the reader.</p> <p>2nd paragraph after Eq. (22): Don't capitalize "Normalized"</p> <p>2nd paragraph after Eq. (23): "nicely fits lowers volume" ... please revise</p> <p>4th paragraph after Eq. (23): "lacunas" ... what is that? Please revise.</p> <p>Some Concluding Remarks - 2nd paragraph: "prove the existence" ... that's a bit too strong. I recommend "indicate the existence" or "suggest the existence". I mean it's an interesting paper but what is presented here is far from rigorous proof.</p> <p>Some Concluding Remarks - 3rd paragraph: Once again, an exclamation mark that could be mistaken for the factorial. Same paragraph also contains some gratuitous capitalization (e.g., "Droplets").</p> <p>Some Concluding Remarks - last paragraph: 'spectacular "Star"' ... what is that supposed to mean? Please revise.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		