

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_96360
Title of the Manuscript:	The unsustainable resistance to a disruptive physics: Cosmology and thermodynamics in new perspective
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>1. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>1. Yes, it is important. It is a new perspective then will open a research window for researchers.</b></p> <p>2. It is suitable however needs to be specified.</p> <p>3. The abstract is almost comprehensive. But it needs to be rewritten and, the abstract can not be two paragraphs.</p> <p>- It seems a simple note. Correction and re-organization are needed.</p> <p>4. The sections and subsections are fine. It is important to show/point out the findings or contribution of the author for the reader. Some graphs or figures show the relation of those parameters like entropy, time, gravity, and so on.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct but what is the specific objective of the author/authors? To fill what gap?</p> <p>6. The references are almost sufficient but need to be corrected. Example, [(11)] why two parentheses? [(11)] should be (11) or [11], and must be uniform throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Under subsection 1.2 what to mean "the mentioned program from 2016"</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is good , it is scholarly communicable. However, the paragraphs and sentences</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### PART 2:

**Review Form 1.7**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gemechu Muleta Kumssa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Space Science and Geospatial Institute, Ethiopia</b>