



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 1, Line 3 of Abstract should read "...on a number of self-evident..." 2. Page 7, Line 4 should read "3. Likewise, for the electroweak..." or "3. Similarly, for the electroweak..." 3. Page 7, Line 6 should read "...space and the acceptability.." 4. Page 7, Line 8 should read "..., Z comprises Dirac..." 5. Page 7, Line 16 should read "...the leptons of Figure 1 is consistent..." 6. Page 7, Line 17 should read "On the other hand, the electroweak theory of the W⁺, Z particles should also provide..." 7. Page 8, Line 9 should read "assumptions" 8. Page 8, Line 16 should read "...elements of Quantum electrodynamics (QED).." 9. Page 8, Line 23 should read "...free of derivatives. Here the derivatives..." (The sentences should be in the same paragraph and the parenthesis should be omitted because it is really confusing) 10. Page 10, Line 13 should read "Besides this..." 11. Page 11, Line 4 from the bottom should read "denotes" 12. Page 13, Line 11 from the bottom should read "equation, the charge takes.." 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pipat Chooto
Department, University & Country	Prince of Songkla University, Thailand