



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_48369
Title of the Manuscript:	On the significance of the Fields' Energy-momentum Tensor
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The topic of this manuscript can be of interest for readers of this valuable Journal. There seems to be no other approach for the significance of the fields' energy-momentum tensor. English language is acceptable according to the Journal's requirement. Comparison between current literature and previous studies shows that the present results are new and correct. Generally speaking, the manuscript is well written and organized. For these reasons I recommend the acceptance of this paper. However, before that the Editor makes a decision, I suggest that the authors take into account the following corrections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The origin of Eq. (2) is not specified.</li> <li>2. Authors must specify a reference for Eq. (5).</li> <li>3. Details on Eq. (12) deduction are needed.</li> <li>4. Some editing "glitches" need to be corrected.</li> <li>5. Punctuations are used randomly. Insert comma or full stop after each and every equation accordingly.</li> <li>6. A very great number of notions and results are "borrowed" from different already published paper. As such, I think the author need to emphasize more clearly the contribution of the manuscript from a scientific point of view.</li> <li>7. References are not uniformly written. For some references, the name of the author is of the form John Schmidt, for other Schmidt John.</li> <li>8. There are many old references that should be replaced with more modern ones.</li> <li>9. Also, I think, the authors must strengthen the References section with some articles that use some similar techniques, to make the techniques used more plausible, for instance: The effect of a dipolar structure on the Holder stability in Green-Naghdi thermoelasticity, Cont Mech Thermodyn, 29(6), 1365-1374, 2017; Cesaro means in thermoelasticity of dipolar bodies, Acta Mechanica, 122(1-4), 155-168, 1997; Convective heat transfer flow of nanofluid in a porous medium over wavy surface, Physics Letters, Section A: General, Atomic and Solid State Physics , 382(38), pp. 2749-2753, 2018</li> </ol> <p>If the author takes into account all these corrections, then this manuscript deserves to be published.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Two well-known textbooks are the source of eq. 2.</li> <li>2. This is already done in the line below eq. (5).</li> <li>3. In (11) the running index <math>\mu</math> is replaced by <math>\nu</math>. This replacement shows that (12) is a straightforward result.</li> <li>4. (item 5) Done appropriately.</li> <li>5. (Item 6) The manuscript shows a new application of the energy-momentum tensor. This issue is stated in the Abstract, in the Introduction and in the last section.</li> <li>6. (Item 7). Now the references are in the Journal's form.</li> <li>7. (Item 9). The manuscript discusses only <i>elementary particles</i>. The revised version states this matter in the Abstract, the Introduction and the Conclusions parts of the manuscript. I do not want to extend its scope.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	