

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_81101
Title of the Manuscript:	Mathematical form space: a new understanding of space in the theory of relativity
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:

(<https://www.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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>In the prepared recent Article it was apparently tried to criticize the Theories of Relativity originally attributed to the renowned & famous physicist Mister Albert Einstein, however, those criticisms at the recent Article could get answers related to the previous readings about the Special Theory Of Relativity and related to some earlier received explanations and partial readings about the General Theory of Relativity.</p> <p>However, after all, both the Theories of Relativity, remained "Theories" until the date of these comments, & The Special Theory of Relativity based its initial claims on the claimed & reportedly published results of the experiment by Mister Michelson & of Mister Morley, & yet if that experiment was flawless then the theoretic mathematics in the Special Theory of Relativity seemed as acceptable to many physicists some of whom had already reached nearly to some of the ideas of the Special Theory of Relativity like the known physicist Mister Hendrik Anton Lorentz, & yet the claims at the Special Theory of Relativity were related to too great values of speeds or velocities if attainable for material, however, also until the date of these comments those great values of speed or velocities were reportedly NOT yet attained for materials.</p> <p>Therefore, although the humble reviewer would NOT have tried to claim the least monopoly about the truth when regarding the Theories of Relativity, still according to the existing standards of acceptances and respects towards the Theories of Relativity which were existing at some many of the physics's communities in the world, & according to the offered comments defending some ideas related to Both Theories of Relativity, and contrary to the criticisms collected in the recently reviewed Article, then the humble reviewer, would NOT have agreed with many of the claims of the recently reviewed Article.</p> <p>However, the humble reviewer would have thought to regard the recently reviewed Article like needing some major revisions, if NOT completely rejectable, and because the recently reviewed Article apparently could stimulate some deeper discussions eventually about The Theories of Relativity.</p> <p>And related to the recently reviewed Article, yet the comparatively detailed comments were typed at another file of about 30 A4 pages and those comments and some images were prepared by the humble reviewer</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[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:	Mirwais Rashid
Department, University & Country	University of Groningen, Netherlands