



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRRI_6994
Title of the Manuscript:	Two-Body Dirac Theory
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:

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



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In my view the manuscript is of high quality research although the main part or the new result presented in section III is not spectacular. I found that the author lies in this work on earlier works in the literature and: -The author (s) show in an introduction that Dirac hole theory is incompatible with the experimental observation of Zitterbewegung. -The author(s) then introduce the QRT and QED and the concept of radiation as a permanent part of quantum states. -The author(s) argue for the concept that the quantum states of matter exist simultaneously and permanently with quantum states of radiation In sec. II then the author developed EOM for electron's radiant aspect and radiant-electron theory. - In section III the author(s) then makes a large step and continue with approximate methods which form the main message of the manuscript. As far as I can see everything seems to be correct in principle, apart from the numerical recipe the author(s) used to tackle the problem, Nevertheless the author(s) kindly asked to concern the following points before the manuscript can be published. 1. Line 233, EOM stays for Equation Of Motion, isn't it? not defined before. 2. Line 507, (I-8) and (I-5) should be replaced by (II-8) and (II-5). 3. Line 624, " Zitterbewe-gung" should be corrected. 4. Line 692, (I-4) should be (II-4). 5. Line 754, (II-2) should be (III-2).	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Line 766, Remarkably the sixth term it is not clear which term is it? it is confusing for the reader, the author is kindly asked to clarify and clearly explain it in better form. 7. Line 769, the conclusion should be section IV (not III).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer