

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Physical Science International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_105475</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Medium and waves clarifying fundamental physics.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I found this study interesting and relevant in the field. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</li> <li>This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and interesting. Another alternative title: <i>Media and waves - fundamental physics clarification</i></li> <li>The <b>abstract</b> is <b>good, clear, firm in writing, comprehensive</b> and <b>correct</b>, and the <b>significant findings</b> have been explicitly and clearly explained. The Keywords is good and correct also.</li> <li>I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are good enough and appropriate. The <b>technical discussion</b> is also <b>quite adequate</b> for a Review Article.</li> <li>This manuscript has been well written following the method of writing a review article. Research Objectives, Hypotheses, Research Justification, Research Scope, everything has been stated properly and clearly. <b>The methods</b> used in solving the problem, the <b>significance</b> and <b>urgency</b> of the problem under study, as well as the <b>significant findings</b> have been <b>explained explicitly and clearly</b>. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>.</li> <li><b>All references</b> have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Journals, Textbook, Archives, Proceedings, and Technical Reports . The number of references is quite sufficient (<b>40 references</b>), with a selection of related references to support the analysis and discussion in this manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>SPECIAL COMMENT</b></p> <p>This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Review Method, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study and the, have all been well and clearly stated. <b>The methods</b> used in solving the problem, the <b>significance</b> and <b>urgency</b> of the problem under study, as well as the <b>significant findings</b> have been <b>explained explicitly and clearly</b>. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>. Analysis and Discussion has also been presented sequentially, well structured and comprehensive. I think this manuscript is <i>scientifically correct</i>. <b>All references</b> have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Journals, Textbook, Archives, Proceedings, and Technical Reports . The number of references is quite sufficient (<b>30 references</b>), with a selection of related references to support the analysis and discussion in this manuscript. <b>Discussion</b> by <i>mentioning</i> some <i>references</i> is <b>very good</b> and <b>sharpens your analysis</b>. Discussions like this also <i>reflect</i> the <i>quality</i> of the authors. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Good enough</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Accept with Minor Revision See the attached file</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Yusuf Suryo Utomo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Research Center for Energy Conversion and Conservation, Indonesia</b>