

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_112818
Title of the Manuscript:	Power plant atom – the search for the origin of the quantum conditions under the paradigm of absolute space
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. The authors presented a well-organized paper and easy-to-read and to-follow. In the realm of nuclear physics, this study is good.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. The abstract should be revised as per comments (below).</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Some grammatical/typographical errors can be found in the document. If there are any typographical or editorial errors, the author should fix them.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The title is misleading, such as "Power plant atom.". I did not find any sentence related to "power plant atom" or related to the objective of the study. Please revise your title based on your actual works that you performed in the manuscript or give some information on power plant atoms in the introduction section. The authors presented a well-organized paper and easy-to-read and to-follow. In the realm of nuclear physics, this study is good. The quality of the pictures is good. This paper has a potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified or fixed before acceptance. In the Abstract section, it is necessary to quantify the results and add some information about the quantitative results. Most of the parts of the abstract should move to the introduction section. The structure of the abstract needs revision. Revise the abstract to provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the significance of the study, the major conclusion of the study The originality of the paper needs to be stated clearly. The Introduction should make a compelling case for why the study is useful along with a clear statement of its novelty or originality by providing relevant information and providing answers to basic questions such as: What is already known in the open literature related to your work? What is missing (i.e., research gaps)? What needs to be done, why and how? Clear statements of the originality of the work should also appear briefly in the Abstract and Conclusions sections. Too much use of first person "we". The statement should be written in the passive voice by the authors. The author(s) should provide the flow diagram of the computer program "C-program QuandBed.cpp". The author(s) should provide a brief description on Euler-Cauchy method In your paper you have mentioned that "One kilogram matter creates a braking power of ca. 3.4×10^{10} [kW]. This is the power of ca. 34.000 power plants, each of them with a power of one million kW". Please clarify the above mentioned sentence. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>9. In your paper, you have mentioned “...we obtain the value $a_{el} = (r v^2)/(2 c^2) = 1.408970 \times 10^{-11}$ [m]. This is exactly half the value of the classical electron radius, which is given in literature as $R_{e,c} = 2.8179403262 \times 10^{-15}$ [m]”. Is this sentence correct?</p> <p>10. Some grammatical/typographical errors can be found in the document. If there are any typographical or editorial errors, the author should fix them. The text lacks a line number. So why is it not possible to mark in the text without a line number? However, a few examples are given below: Paragraphs At this juncture.....in direction--□ in the direction We would like..... Both, the gravitational-□ Both the gravitational.... The orbital frequency ω_o circular path of nucleus □ circular path of the nucleus. For a hydrogen atom..... Both, the rotational-□ Both the rotational Then, the force effect of the.....in direction of the radius--□ in the direction of the radius However, between Bohr’s circularthere exist still--□ there still exist In the cases of instable orbits..... the action is reverse-□ the action is reversed we obtain as smoothed curve-□ we obtain a smoothed curve electron on Bohr’s circular orbits-□ electron in Bohr’s circular orbits. 1.000052, 2.000214, und 3.000685-□ 1.000052, 2.000214, and 3.000685. obtain a tree-dimensional structure-□ obtain a three-dimensional structure However, the AFM raises still man-□ However, the AFM still raises despite of the fact-□ despite the fact one finds that, it assumes-□ one finds that it assumes disallowed orbit in direction-□ disallowed orbit in the direction a reason of our disregard, -□ a reason for our disregard, the principal quantum number 2 to 1 has the very-□ the principal quantum number 2 to 1 has a very we treated DeBroglie-waves-□ we treated DeBroglie-waves The imagination that electrons-□ The idea that electrons energy suggests however, the idea-□ energy suggests, however, the idea</p> <p>11. Many “Instable” words should be replaced by “unstable”.</p> <p>12. The conclusion is poor. It should be rewritten according to the significance of the results.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Abdus Sattar Mollah
Department, University & Country	Military Institute of Science and Technology, Bangladesh