



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_32396
Title of the Manuscript:	Remarks on the Significance of Pentaquark Classification
Type of the Article	Original research Paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It seems that 40% or more of the manuscript are using references. I understand this to be an original manuscript Section 3 is very well done. Categories are well explained.	I try to provide an adequate amount of references in order to help readers to check the Validity of my claims. Many thanks.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please recheck formula 3.2	It looks OK. uuu are the Δ^{++} valence quarks. As required by QFT, each of the additional quark-antiquark pair belongs to the same flavour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Explain real world applications and possible applications. Explained very well but early part of manuscript looked like a review article.	I do not see any real pentaquark application and I've never seen this issue in the vast pentaquark literature. It is well known that authors try to find a compromise between clarity and conciseness of the text. Not all readers have the same background. Due to this fact, the paper is my version of such a compromise.