

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_80951
Title of the Manuscript:	Simple Superluminal Entangled Communication Scheme and Its Base of Special Relativity
Type of the Article	Physics

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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The manuscript "Simple Superluminal Entangled Communication Scheme and Its Base of Special Relativity" is a good, very interesting and well documented paper, synthesizing a lot of quantum physics and relativity theory and literature and connecting these two fields of physics. It also has a lot of references throughout its content, all these indicating a very good knowledge of the field.</p> <p>However, there are some important issues within paper which necessarily need to be addressed before this paper is published. English of paper is to be revised seriously, here and there, in order that paper content can be understood. For example, in Abstract: "We observe and control the information of A position, then can know the corresponding results of the other B. This is not to send directly information each other. It may be superluminal". The adverb "necessarily" is used incorrectly in many places in paper, when the correct term should be "necessary". In page 3, "A and B are all" is to be replaced with "A and B are both". In page 5 of the manuscript, the phrase "...superluminal action is true, therefore this must apply GLT" should be revised, in order to be understood. In the last page of paper "seems to be inconsistencies" should be replaced with "seems to be inconsistent". Moreover, in section 4 of paper, in the formula (5), a space should be placed after comma, in order to understand that there are two formulae, one for distance and another for time. In the same section 4, there are different font types used. So, the paper should be also formatted in order to have in its entire content the same font/size type.</p> <p>Another important issue which also should be addressed is that the paper has no Conclusion section. Some conclusions of paper are placed in the final section, but these are to be completed and listed in a separate section of paper named Conclusion.</p> <p>Recommendation of reviewer: Major compulsory revisions required</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Catalin Silviu Nutu
Department, University & Country	Constanta Maritime University, Romania