

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_76576
Title of the Manuscript:	Two Kinds of Vacuum in Casimir Effect
Type of the Article	

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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 article is devoted to discussion of vacuum properties in the context of the Casimir effect. The main idea is to clarify its quantum nature. In spite of that is a well established fact, there are still debates in the literature. The author tries to discuss various features of the Casimir effect and physical vacuum. The article doesn't add practically anything to the field. Its level is much lower than the one of, e.g., book "Advances in the Casimir Effect" (ref. [29] in the article). By the way, the title of the book is spelled in the article incorrectly. The only value of the article consists in author's personal poin of view on the subjects.</p> <p>There are scattered misprints, see e.g. "Hamillon" instead of "Hamilton" in the first line of Sect. 4 (page 7) and "vacaam" instead of "vacuum" on page 11. The author also extensively uses semicolons instead of dots to separate sentences. So, an extended technical editing is required.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, this article doesn't contain any new result. It is a kind of a mini-review with some ideas about interpretation of the known facts. The lack of novelty in the article raises the question of the possibility of its publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrej Arbuzov
Department, University & Country	Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Russia