

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_99370
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Negative Wave Velocity and Advanced Waves in Electromagnetism
Type of the Article	Physical science

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>)

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)
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)	no no my suggestion is (Negative Velocity Characteristics in Electromagnetism) no too long subsections many sections and equation without reference (red lines in the original paper)so there are no authorized sections	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not good many paragraphs not written in the passive voice standing	
Optional/General comments	1. Not good title 2. Abstract must be re write it, why the author mentioned is wrong! Statement 3. Missing optimum result in the last lines of abstract 4. Omit advanced solution in the results because it is meaningless 5. In introduction, waves are not phenomena it is nature of light in the universe , wave propagation is a phenomena 6. too long paragraphs without references (red lines) 7. All equations without references 8. Too long paper 9. Too long conclusion remark 10. Why the author write references in this style	

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:	Tahreer Safa'a Mansour
Department, University & Country	Baghdad University, Laser Institute for Postgraduate Studies, Iraq