

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_96694
Title of the Manuscript:	Gravitational displacement: Time dilation rooted in vacuum energy
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript submitted to this journal entitled " <b>Gravitational displacement: Time dilation rooted in vacuum energy</b> " is an interesting topic for publication. But the authors need to make some <b>minor revisions</b>, which is given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The topic of the manuscript is interesting and important for the scientific community. Dealing with this topic is very interesting and exciting and has a high scientific level and also is acceptable to the scientific community.</li> <li>2) The title of this manuscript is ambiguous and needs to be corrected.</li> <li>3) The abstract section is very short and the contents are not arranged and the conclusion is not clearly reported.</li> <li>4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5) The manuscript is scientifically acceptable.</li> <li>6) It is better to use newer references</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	- No. The manuscript should be corrected in terms of native English grammar.	
<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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maziar Naderi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>