



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 55397

Title: Articles of the Written Prototype Constitution of Matter: We are not alone in the Universe! First Evidence: The Ancient Planet Mars,

Recommendation:
Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓,			
Techn. Quality	✓,			
Clarity	✓,			
Significance	✓,			

Reviewer Name: Dr Abdul Haseeb Mir

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The article presents an ambitious and highly unconventional thesis that seeks to establish a universal “Prototype Constitution of Matter” governing all organic and inorganic systems in the universe, and uses this framework to argue for the inevitability of extraterrestrial life, with ancient Mars offered as the first concrete empirical example. The manuscript attempts to integrate insights from geology, astrophysics, chemistry, biology, and philosophy of science into a single explanatory model, positioning matter itself as an evolving, self-regulating, and inherently life-sustaining entity.

One of the most striking strengths of the article is its interdisciplinary scope. The author demonstrates extensive familiarity with geological processes, mineralogy, sedimentary rock formation, and planetary science, particularly in the discussion of chalk and chalky-evaporite formations as biogenic indicators. The comparison between terrestrial chalk formations and stratigraphic units observed in the Gale and Jezero craters on Mars is presented with confidence and geological detail. The insistence that biochemically formed carbonate rocks necessarily imply prior microbial life is a clear, testable claim that aligns with certain strands of astrobiological reasoning. In this sense, the paper contributes to ongoing debates about biosignatures and the interpretation of Martian sedimentary environments.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The conceptual originality of the proposed “Constitution of Matter” is another notable contribution. By formulating a series of immutable “laws” governing matter’s tendency toward stability, integration, phase change, and evolutionary progression, the author attempts to move beyond descriptive geology toward a unifying theoretical framework. This effort to articulate general principles that cut across disciplines is intellectually bold and reflects a desire to rethink dominant assumptions in both planetary science and natural philosophy.

However, the manuscript also exhibits serious conceptual and methodological weaknesses that must be addressed. The most significant issue concerns the status of the proposed laws. While the author presents the articles of the Constitution of Matter as universally valid, they are largely asserted rather than rigorously demonstrated. Many claims are framed in normative or metaphysical language—such as matter having “responsibilities,” “intentions,” or an inherent moral orientation toward positivity—which blurs the boundary between scientific explanation and philosophical speculation. This anthropomorphic framing weakens the scientific clarity of the argument and risks undermining its credibility within empirical research traditions.

A second concern relates to engagement with existing scholarship. Although NASA data and planetary imagery are referenced, the article does not sufficiently engage with mainstream astrobiological literature, competing interpretations of Martian geology, or current debates on abiotic versus biotic carbonate formation. Claims such as the rejection of impact craters in favor of sinkhole formations, or the assertion that large extraterrestrial collisions are incompatible with the laws of matter, directly contradict well-established scientific consensus and therefore require exceptionally strong empirical justification, which is presently lacking.

Stylistically, the manuscript is excessively long and repetitive, with extended digressions into moral, political, and ethical commentary that distract from the core scientific argument. These sections, while expressive, would be more appropriate in a reflective essay than in a research article. Greater concision, clearer sectioning, and tighter argumentative focus are essential.

In conclusion, the article is highly original and provocative, offering a novel synthesis that may stimulate interdisciplinary discussion. However, its current form falls short of the methodological rigor and theoretical discipline expected of a research article. Substantial revisions are required to clarify the

REVIEWER'S REPORT

epistemological status of the proposed laws, strengthen engagement with existing scientific literature, and sharply distinguish empirical claims from philosophical interpretation.

Recommendation: The manuscript is **not suitable for publication** in its present form, but it may be reconsidered after major revisions, particularly if the author narrows the scope, strengthens empirical validation, and reframes speculative elements within a clearly defined theoretical or philosophical framework.