



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_10137
Title of the Manuscript:	Is black hole geometry – the eternal cosmic geometry?
Type of the Article	Review 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In "Discussion and Conclusions" paragraph, the sentences in line 765-791 are not the discussions or conclusions about the subject of the manuscript. If needed to be expressed in, it ought to be arranged under a subtitle like that of "Expectation".</li> <li>2. In "Discussion and Conclusions", the sentences from line 765 to 767 need to be deleted. Because their combination has been performed and resulted in the famous Dirac equation.</li> <li>3. From the contents in line 339-763, it looks like the manuscript an original research paper rather than the review one. The reference numbers need to be inserted in due course.</li> <li>4. A good review paper ought to acts like a teacher that, collecting meaningful papers with less miss and with proper comment (not arbitration) introducing the main viewpoints to wide spread readers clearly by simple sentences.</li> <li>5. The first abbreviation ought to appear with its full name, e.g. Supersymmetry (SUSY), Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation (CMBR).</li> <li>6. Two recent related papers ought to be cited in. They are: Zhenhua Mei, Shuyu Mei. A guess model of black holes and the evolution of universe. Journal of modern physics, 2012, 3(20): 1190–1198; Zhen-hua Mei, Shu-yu Mei. No Needs of Neutrinos in Theoretical Calculation of <math>\beta</math> Decay. Indian Journal of Science, 2013, 3(6): 11–14.</li> <li>7. Some clerical errors:</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Split into sections 15.1 and 15.2.</li> <li>2. Deleted</li> <li>3. New references included</li> <li>4. New section (13) and (14) added.</li> <li>5. Expanded for the first time</li> <li>6. Included in section 15.3</li> <li>7. Clerical errors corrected. Please excuse me sir.</li> <li>8. As the subject is new, presented for better view and updated with new sections as suggested by reviewers for large numbers. Request you to permit it.</li> <li>9. Changed title: <b>Basics of black hole cosmology – A very review.</b></li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Antetype                      In line,      Suggesting form</p> <p>mean                          42,              means</p> <p>radius r .                      55,              radius r.</p> <p>of r .                          58,              of r.</p> <p>. The                          72,              , the</p> <p>Modern                      114,              modern</p> <p>point, or singularity. 133,              point.</p> <p>time are                      149,              time is</p> <p>approach .                      159,              approach.</p> <p>authors                      162,              researchers</p> <p>Proposed Picture of Black Hole Cosmology</p> <p>                                    223,              proposed picture of black</p> <p>hole cosmology</p> <p>                                    337,375,428,480, 605,</p> <p>                                    622, 716,764,</p> <p>To Re-                      375,              Re-</p> <p>likel y                      384,              likely</p> <p>may not be due to      385,              may not be true due to</p> <p>charge” ?                      441,              charge”?</p> <p>time                      486, 506      time,</p> <p>is 2.723 <sup>0</sup>K .                      490,              would be 2.723 K.</p> <p>radiation. [45                      497,              radiation [45</p> <p>be confirmed                      501,              is confirmed</p> <p>fun .                          569,              fun.</p> <p><sup>0</sup>K.m                      601,              K.m</p> <p>vedic                      732, 734,      Vedic</p> <p>j.sec                      759,760,      J.sec</p> <p>without ... not deny 793-794, (<i>can't be understood</i>)</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	8. As a review paper generally, the deduced mathematical processes are unnecessarily to be repeated expression such as in line 339-763.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	9. The title does not fit the main contents well.	