



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_47006
Title of the Manuscript:	Differences Between Two Weak Interaction Theories
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>)

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	The article violates the standard scientific approach: instead of verification of the suggested new approach to weak interactions the author devotes almost all the space to critics of the Standard Model (SM). The critics by itself contains a lot of technical errors, e.g. in Eq.(2) instead of a Dirac spinor, the author uses the 4-momentum vector (1,0,0,0). The main advantage of the SM is that it produces predictions which agree with experimental data. The author suggests to re-write the weak interactions in a different form. Then he must provide the corresponding predictions for observable quantities and compare the with the experimental data. He must also verify the theoretical consistency (unitarity, renormalizability, gauge invariance, etc.). Concerning the latter, it is obvious (just by the dimension analysis) that the last term in Eq.(3) provides breaking of unitarity and can not be renormalized.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Publication of such articles would destroy the scientific reputation of the journal.	

PART 2:

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



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Andrej B. Arbuzov Bogoliubov</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Russia</i>