

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Chemical Science International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CSIJ_95876</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ELECTROMAGNETIC PARTICLES: FORMATION OF "MATTERS" AND "ANTIMATTERS"</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>Yes it gives new approach , but the authors should be careful of their new ideas</b></p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>yes</b></p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? <b>yes</b></p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? <b>yes</b></p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <b>( see my comments in the right side)</b></p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>yes</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> <p><b>( see my comments in the right side)</b></p>	<p>1- CORRECTIONS for bad English language ( shown in <b>Red Colour</b> on the attached original corrected manuscript )</p> <p>2- There are many scientific problems , ( shown in <b>blue and green</b> colours on the attached original corrected manuscript ), i.e.:</p> <p>2-1 This new scientific approach ( i.e. ELECTROMAGNETIC PARTICLES) looking peculiar for many considerations , it violates many physical well established laws , thus I cannot agree with this new theory!!</p> <p>2-2 In page no. 2 ( <b>shown in blue</b> ) how can the authors justify the presence of electrons inside the nucleus?</p> <p>2-3 In page no.4 and 10 ( <b>shown in green</b> ) how can the authors justify the formation of protons from electron - positron pairs , knowing that the rest mass os each of them is 0.511 MeV , While the rest mass of proton is 938 MeV??</p> <p>2-4 In page no.9 : equations 20 and 21 should be adjusted to allow for neutrino and anti-neutrino presence , as known!! , thus the authors cannot explain the weak beta decay!!, the statement <b>However, matter never turns into energy</b>, is not known in physics?!</p> <p>2-5 In page no.10 : equations 22 and 23 should be adjusted to allow for neutrino and anti-neutrino presence. The statement : <b>which practically excludes the formation of an "antiproton", and therefore, "antimatter". Is not true , since there are experiments nowadays detecting the presence of antiprotons??!!</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<b>Not suitable ( see comments above )</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Mohammed Eldaghmah
Department, University & Country	College of Criminal Justice, Naif Arab University for Security Sciences, Saudi Arabia