

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_84307
Title of the Manuscript:	Coherence Tests of Physical Theories
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>)

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	(i) Page 8, line 12, ".....the total p-p cross-section should decrease faster than the total e-p cross-section. The data of fig. 1 strongly refutes this prediction."; Figure 1 shows data for p-p cross-section and data for e-p cross-section is not presented, then on what basis the above conclusion is drawn?	
Minor REVISION comments	(i) Page 2, line 21, ".....pp. 85-6)."; pp. 85-6 needs to be corrected. (ii) Page 5, line 15, "QCD is the theory of....."; what is full form of QCD? (iii) Page 14, last line, "The book [8] contains a more detailed analysis of these issues." This line may be deleted since concluding remarks are to discuss the present work only.	
Optional/General comments	Analogous relationships hold between general relativity and the Newtonian theory of gravitation, and between quantum mechanics and classical physics. This work shows that this approach can be extended and yield coherence tests of additional theories. This work provides a few examples that show the effectiveness of this approach and demonstrate inconsistent points of some mainstream physical ideas.	

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:	Vipin Jain
Department, University & Country	CSIR-National Physical Laboratory, Dr. K.S. Krishnan Marg, India