



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
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

	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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". 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. 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. 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. 5. The first abbreviation ought to appear with its full name, e.g. Supersymmetry (SUSY), Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation (CMBR). 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 β Decay. Indian Journal of Science, 2013, 3(6): 11–14. 7. Some clerical errors: 	



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 ⁰K . 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>⁰K.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>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	8. As a review paper generally, the deduced mathematical processes are unnecessarily to be repeated expression such as in line 339-763.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	9. The title does not fit the main contents well.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhen-hua Mei
Department, University & Country	College of Chemistry and Molecular Engineering, Qingdao University of Science and Technology, China