

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_87811
Title of the Manuscript:	4D Space-Time Contraction PK 2D Lorentz Contraction
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalspsij.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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This paper is an exploration and study of the fundamental problems of physics. It requires a person to invest a lot of time and energy in this kind of research that can neither make money nor be recognized by others. From this point of view, I think the work of the author of this article is worthy of respect. Of course, we should also be able to provide a suitable place, so that people like the author who are still struggling to explore the basic theories of physics can also have a voice.</p> <p>From the content of this paper, this paper studies the most basic problems of space-time in physics. At present, for the exploration of space and time, the general consensus is the theory of relativity. Einstein's theory of relativity is divided into special relativity and general relativity. One of the most controversial is the special theory of relativity. The author is also targeting the space-time view in the special theory of relativity, especially the Lorenz contraction problem. The author proposes a view of omnidirectional contraction, which is somewhat different from the Lorenz contraction. Judging from the argument of this paper, there is no big logical problem found. Although there may actually be many people with different views, I believe it is very beneficial to have a different view to promote our thinking.</p> <p>At present, outside the mainstream physics, there are many authors who have doubts about some theories such as the theory of relativity, and the number is still very large. It can even be said that an academic faction against the theory of relativity has been formed. These academic factions have their own journals and forums, and even organize various exchange meetings on a regular basis. More importantly, with the increase of time, these academic factions that oppose the theory of relativity do not seem to show signs of decline, and new members can continue to be added. That is to say, the ability to have a normal metabolism. In this case, as an academic viewpoint, even the mainstream physics community should not ignore or completely reject it, and perhaps some of their viewpoints are also enlightening.</p> <p>Compared with other papers against the theory of relativity, this paper has some innovations and new viewpoints. It can exist as a more typical view of this academic factions. Therefore, I still recommend the public publication of this paper. If you feel that this view is hurtful to your feelings, you can ignore it completely and just ignore him. Of course, if you think this article is still instructive, then browse it, it may give you some new ideas about the basic theory of physics.</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)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhi Cheng
Department, University & Country	China