

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_94317
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Non-Relativistic Space-Time View and the Covariation of Maxwell's Equations
Type of the Article	Review

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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

1

	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>The submitted review paper is authored by a very productive scientist. The ideas and works presented on superluminal light speed in vacuum for quantum entanglement are unique and pioneering supported by powerful tests such as 2022 Nobel Award in physics and Pan's quantum satellite in China. However, the paper is presented in somewhat of a book style. A major revision is recommended for a balanced treatment of the experimental aspect of QM with the logical aspect of Einstein.</p> <p>Notably, the paper focused on spacetime and faster-than-light speed in favor of tests over analytics. But the aether theory proposed does not seem to be logical. Without equilibrium and logically definable causality, truth in spacetime may not be enough. Re. Quote1 from abstract: "In this paper, physical vacuum is proposed as the main option of "new ether".It emphasizes that quantum non-locality is a non-relativistic view of time and space and has been successful.It emphasizes the possibility of superluminal motion and suggests the establishment of "Superluminal Light Physics" as a new discipline. This paper makes a sharp criticism on Einstein's SR theory and viewpoint, which can be used for reference." Quote2 (from "4 As one of the non-relativistic space-time views, quantum non-locality finally wins"): "the key is to establish a correct view of time and space, world outlook. Professor Wen-Miao Song, a famous Chinese expert on electromagnetic theory and a good friend of mine, once commented on the widespread belief in the theory of Relativity: "Truth cannot be obtained by faith and worship, only the nature is the standard by which we scientists test everything."</p> <p>Some key questions to be answered are:</p> <p>If "quantum non-locality finally wins", what is the logical or experimental causality of QM?</p> <p>Is quantum entanglement logical or purely statistical?</p> <p>Can Aristotle's causality principle as the cornerstone of science be abandoned?</p> <p>Suggestions: Remove some biased personal views against logical invention. Instead, it should incorporate logically definable causality and spacetime emergence in a background independent geometry. Logically, spacetime can emerge from bipolar relativity and quantum entanglement. Here, empiricism and analytics should come to joint forces. Even someone at the 2022 Nobel Prize site suggested that perhaps time emerged from quantum entanglement.</p> <p>Of course, Galileo, Newton, Einstein, and Bohr came short of reaching a complete theory of physics for quantum entanglement/superposition because Greek philosophy as a basis of modern science failed to reach logically definable causality and mind-matter unification since the beginning of science and philosophy. But now, such a logic has appeared as a formal system.</p> <p>The views of this submission on Einstein's relativity theories need to be impartial as relativity theories have been widely accepted</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>and applied in the classical world. Of course, relativity and QM both need a grand unification beyond spacetime geometries as both are incomplete in terms of lacking a causal logical and geometrical system for spacetime emergence. Although Einstein’s local realism did not find quantum causality, and Bohr was right on the existence of quantum superposition and entanglement, Einstein was the first and only one who predicted that “physics constitutes a logical system of thought” The logical idea of Einstein has now led to logically definable causality for quantum non-locality to resolve the EPR and Cat paradoxes (re. “Quantum logic has been exemplified by Dirac’s famous 3-polarizer experiment, but recently, an analysis for bipolar crisp and fuzzy sets has provided new insights into the old question.” https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnbot.2022.910161/full). Notably, the logical approach has led to a formal analytical quantum paradigm named quantum intelligence (QI) (re. DOI: 10.1109/JAS.2021.1003868; DOI: 10.3233/JIFS-210692).</p> <p>Some scientists (including but are not limited to Chinese scientists) misunderstood Einstein’s theory as worship and faith to God. Actually, Spinoza-Einstein’s God is Nature. That might have been why Einstein is deemed an atheist by some people in the West. Spiritually, Nature with unlimited power has to be some type of “God” for a scientist, believer or atheist, to limit/eliminate the possibility of any human play of “God” role. Hopefully, some related misunderstanding can be avoided.</p> <p>Note: Spinoza defined God as Nature. Spinoza’s God provided a living natural God. Leibniz claimed that things cause one another because God ordained a pre-established divine harmony among everything in the universe. Clearly, equilibrium, harmony and Spinoza’s God are related. Einstein combined the above views and famously stated: “I believe in Spinoza’s God who reveals himself in the orderly harmony of what exists, not in a God who concerns himself with the fates and actions of human beings.” Einstein also said: “Everyone who is seriously involved in the pursuit of science becomes convinced a spirit is manifest in the laws of the Universe—a spirit vastly superior to that of man, and one in the face of which we with our modest powers must feel humble. In this way the pursuit of science leads to a religious feeling of a special sort, which is indeed quite different from the religiosity of someone more naive.” Hopefully, Chinese scientists will realize that Spinoza-Einstein’s “God” idea is so far the closest western idea to the Chinese Dao that has been widely referenced as the Way.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The English is good but may need some revision and grammar checking. Especially, book style writing should be changed to journal article style	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wen-Ran Zhangc
Department, University & Country	USA