



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Review &amp; Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>MS: 2012/PRRI/2399</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The classical mechanics from the quantum equation.</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:**

**(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)**

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2:** 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>This manuscript should be rejected.</b> It seems to be nothing but a very poorly executed extract from two other manuscripts by the same author, available at arXiv.org, article-ids 1007.4198 and 1210.1138, of which the former (Ref. 5 in the present manuscript) apparently has been submitted for publication elsewhere (J. Math. Phys). The Conclusion section in the present manuscript is almost word for word the same as in Ref. 5, and the analysis of the Schrödinger equation is identical to the analysis presented in arXiv:1210.1138. The whole thing becomes ridiculous in line 203 of the present manuscript, where the reader is referred to reference numbers 37 and 38 but the manuscript only lists 5 references! This line is copied right out of arXiv:1210.1138, which does, in fact, have these references in the reference list.</p>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous Reviewer</b>
Department, University & Country	