SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_PRRI_3157
Title of the Manuscript:	Charged Black Holes with Yang-Mills Hair and Their Thermodynamics

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

• This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (<i>if agreed with reviewer,</i> correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	 (1) Line 102: It seems that the correct definition of the (dimensionless) parameter \$q\$ should be: \$q=Q/r_H\$. (2) Line 109 Eq. (9): It seems that the expression \$2(1+q^2)\$ should be corrected to \$(1+q^2)/2\$ [see Eq (5) with f=0]. (3) Line 116: The authors claim that in the extremal case, \$w'(r)\$ diverges at the horizon. I believe that it would improve the quality of the paper if the authors could provide an analytical proof for this claim. (4) Line 149 Eq. (11): The expression which is presented for the black-hole entropy seems odd. It is well-known that the black-hole entropy is given by \$A/4hbar\$, where \$A\$ is the horizon surface area. Thus, the black-hole entropy should be given by \$\pi (r_H)^2\$. (5) Line 175: The authors claim that: "For an isolated colored black hole, the heat capacity change its signs two times when the mass changes." I would like to ask the authors to provide a new figure with the heat capacity of the black holes which are studied in the present manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments	(1)Line 26: It seems more appropriate to replace the word "thermodynamics" by the word "physics".	

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(2) Line 144 Eq. (10); I believe that it would improve the quality of the paper if the authors could provide a clear derivation of Eq. (10).(3) Line 184: It seems that the word "the" at the end of the line should be changed to "of".	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous Reviewer
Department, University & Country	