



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_50051
Title of the Manuscript:	The Big Bang or the Conductivity of the Interstellar Space
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper discusses the big bang theory and the conductivity of the interstellar space. The hypothesis of the non-zero conductivity of the interstellar space is explained. In addition to this, the cosmological model is described. Then, discussion and analysis are made. Overall, the content of the paper gives a briefly description regarding to the big bang theory cosmological model. However, the presentation of the paper shall be further improved. Some comments are given as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract shall be written in a paragraph. 2. Do not understand why the paragraphs are not written in a proper way, only consists one or two sentences, it seems the paper is less organized. 3. In Line 43, please give a citation to "Maxwell equations". 4. The equations are joint together with the text, it shows a messy. The equations shall be written in a new line and be organized. 5. Please put the numbering to the equations. 6. In Line 120, see "a value of $1/e$", what is "e"? Please define. 7. Please use MATHTYPE to typeset the equations. 8. Title of Section 4.4 is too long. Can it be refined? The same comment is also for the title of Section 5. 9. No sentence to mention Figure 1. Please write a sentence to mention Figure 1 in the text. 10. All references are from the Wikipedia, except the references [20]-[22], [41], why this happen? The correctness of the information in this paper is questioned. As a research paper, references shall be from the scientific articles and the journal articles. Please take note. 11. There are some grammatical mistakes, please do the correction carefully. 	<p>Ad 1 – the main ideas in the abstract are separated into paragraphs. Ad 2 – Separate thoughts are described in separate paragraphs to allow the reader to better follow the logic of the text. Ad 3 – added without changing the numbering of the links Ad 4,5 – is intentional for better clarity of the text. Strict numbering of equations and segregation into separate lines would significantly lengthen the text and make the text logic unclear. Ad 6 – modified, is defined in [8] - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E_(mathematical_constant) Ad 7 – Microsoft Word is used. MATHTYPE is not included in Submission Preparation Checklist. Ad 8 – 4.4. - shortened Ad 9 - added Ad 10 – Wikipedia provides a comprehensive description of commonly used terms, including Big Bang. Moreover, this is universally recognized and accessible online information source. Therefore, references to selected paper physics and math textbooks are not used. Ad 11 – checked by spell checker. Errors found removed.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	