

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 publication has adapted 6 years of work. This had brought important update to the scientific community with recent findings in the article where the quoted reference is up to this year publication. 2. Suitable Title. 3. Comprehensive to provide the insight details of the article. 4. Appropriate and well written. 5. Scientifically Correct with enough reference 6. Author has used sufficient references and recent till current year.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is clearly suitable for scholarly article communications.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subramaniam Jahanadan
Department, University & Country	Kolej Matrikulasi Labuan, Malaysia