



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_18291
Title of the Manuscript:	ELECTRO-GRAVITY VIA GEOMETRIC CHRONON FIELD
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I found the topic addressed is interesting, however, the way the paper is written is very confusing. First of all, it is hard to know what the authors really want. Besides, there are many confusing equations which are mixed all together where quantum field theory is mixed with general relativity in a strange way. I would like to ask authors to rewrite the paper in a professional way, starting from the general idea, objectives, motivations, mathematical tools used, etc... The paper requires a major revision and I am interested to read the revised version.	1) Why confusing ? The idea of the paper is to construe material fields as prohibition on geodesic motion curves of any small clock that measures non-zero time and interacts with matter not through gravity. This is done by an acceleration field which is not anticipated by General Relativity because in gravity fields motion curves are geodesic. More explanations were added to the paper, especially regarding the issues considered as "confusing". 2) "Besides, there are many confusing equations which are mixed all together where quantum field theory is mixed with general relativity in a strange way". Detailed explanation in section 4 was added and Equation (28) was removed. More explanations were added to the introduction. Hopefully the explanations will make the paper clearer. The claim is incorrect because the representation of the acceleration field, i.e. non-geodesic motion is NOT of a quantum field. The degrees of freedom in the representation of the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		acceleration field do manifest $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ But the author does not intend to reconstruct QFT !!! If The author, could then this theory would be a TOE which is not demanded from other physicist. 3) "The paper requires a major revision and I am interested to read the revised version." Well, that would mean to have a TOE. This is a very tough demand that was not asked from any known physicist. Reconstructing QFT from the acceleration field that prevents geodesic motion means TOE because it would leave physics with only two fields, one that curves space-time, i.e. gravity, and one that curves trajectories of sub-luminal clocks in relation to geodesic curves, and that would be matter. 4) In light of the new findings: http://www.ign.com/articles/2015/04/28/nasa-may-have-invented-a-warp-drive Photons, by Dr. Hans Giertz behave as pairs of intertwined virtual +e and -e charge. Slight imbalance, say of 1% in 10^{24} photons is equivalent to charge separation of $\pm 10^{22} \times 1.6 \times 10^{-19}$ coulombs $\sim \pm 1600$ coulombs, way beyond what is needed to overcome the field of the Earth. That obviously offers a technological breakthrough which is not less important than a full prediction of QFT.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Prevention of publication of the offered paper will have a devastating impact on the technological future of developing countries. By Dennis Sciama inertial induction, such countries will benefit from electro-gravitational technologies by energy production. Also please refer to the experiments by Dr. David Pares from Nebraska. With slight caution I would say that the presentation of Yildiz motor in Delft is real and that the paper can account for it. Obviously, prevention of publication and especially of the discussed symmetries will only prevent a serious investigation of electro-gravitational Dennis Sciama inertial induction effects and their ability to extract energy from space-time
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		