



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>)

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>Line 56: These terms were not explained in the paper. Define them</p> <p>Line 125: How the frequency will change? There is no mechanism, He should explain why?</p> <p>Line 135: CMB is radiation in Microwave region of light from stars, Galaxies etc, he should check mathematically, No Bigbang generated CMB found yet..</p>	<p>Line 56 – added</p> <p>Line 125 – consequence of the hypothesis described earlier (2.1 Ageing Light - The Planck-Einstein relation remains valid also in the case of loss of photon energy when light propagates in conductive material.)</p> <p>L135 – described as a hypothesis explains the CMB radiation interstellar material, not as a result of the Big Bang or starlight. This does not exclude that a portion of the measured CMB has also been irradiated by star material directly in the microwave region, or even by a shorter wavelength, and has been converted to micro wave radiation due to the aging of light.</p> <p>An important property of the formulated hypothesis is on lines 139-143</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Line 230: Yes he correctly said that , our knowledge about the universe is limited.	No comment

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)	