

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The article explains the expansion of space-time, as well as an approach to the relationship between entropy and time. These concepts and new approaches are useful in the study of cosmology and thermodynamics. 2. The title is appropriate for this article. 3. I suggest that the explanatory content be merged into a single paragraph. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think the article is scientifically correct in what it wants to express. 6. The references are sufficient, and most of them are current references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I suggest that the English language writing be revised again to improve the clarity of the article.	
Optional/General comments	Accepted with minor modification.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ronald Fernando Rodriguez Espinoza
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma del Perú, Perú