

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	PhysicalScience InternationalJournal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_126932
Title of the Manuscript:	Explorationof the Specific Formsof Electron Spin
Type of the Article	

PART1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correctthemanuscriptand highlight thatpart in the manuscript. It is mandatory thatauthors shouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript explores a novel concept of electron spin using a "wave element material structure" to challenge the traditional point-particle model, which holds great potential to impact the fields of quantum mechanics and materials science. The discussion on electron spin structure is pertinent, especially given the theoretical challenges in reconciling classical and quantum views. However, while the ideas presented are innovative, further clarification and elaboration on the practical applications and broader implications are recommended to strengthen the manuscript's impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Exploration of the Specific Forms of Electron Spin," is descriptive but could benefit from a slight adjustment to highlight the novel approach. A suggestion is: "Re-evaluating Electron Spin through Wave Element Material Structure Theory" or "A Wave Element Approach to Electron Spin: Breaking from the Point Particle Model." This title better reflects the manuscript's challenge to conventional models.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract outlines the core premise of the study but could be improved by briefly summarizing the key findings and their significance in a more structured format. Adding a statement on how this approach to electron spin could address specific gaps or challenges in quantum mechanics would provide readers with a clearer understanding of the study's objectives and potential impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsection organization of the manuscript are appropriate, but certain sections would benefit from more explicit headings, especially where the manuscript transitions from theoretical assumptions to their implications. For example, within the "Basic Assumptions" section, distinct headings for each hypothesis or prediction would improve readability and make the arguments easier to follow.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a scientifically ambitious and technically sound argument within the theoretical framework it proposes. It challenges established quantum mechanics models by suggesting an alternative explanation for electron spin. The arguments are generally well-constructed, but for better robustness, including references to experimental data that support or align with the new model's predictions would enhance credibility. Additionally, deeper comparisons to existing spin models would help justify the theoretical shift being proposed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The manuscript includes references, but several are outdated or lack direct relevance to contemporary quantum mechanical models. Incorporating more recent sources, particularly studies on alternative interpretations of electron spin and modern quantum mechanical advancements, would provide additional context. Suggestions include recent reviewson electron spin structure and modern developments in wave-particle duality.	

ReviewForm3

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication but could be refined for clarity. Certain sentences are complex and would benefit from simplified wording to improve readability. For example, sentences like "The concept of point particle material structure is a deeply ingrained manifestation" could be rephrased to avoid ambiguous expressions. A thorough proofreading for minor grammatical and syntactical improvements is also recommended.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Major Revision: Key areas for improvement include strengthening the abstract, enhancing structure and readability, updating references, and adding recent supporting data. This will ensure the manuscript's theoretical contributions are communicated clearly and effectively to the scientific community.	

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:	Le Ngoc Long
Department, University & Country	School of Engineering and Technology, Tra Vinh University, Vietnam