



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_50463
Title of the Manuscript:	Advantages of the Mathematical Structure of a Dirac Fermion
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The English language of manuscript needs major revision.</li> <li>2. The literature review is poor and the authors should use updated references to define the novelty of their article clearly.</li> <li>3. In results and discussion, the authors should discuss on their results deeply.</li> <li>4. The authors should show the comparison between their results and previous works.</li> </ol>	<p>The following remarks refer to the corresponding points of this reviewer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The paper's text has been tested by several utilities. Furthermore, no other reviewer says a remark like this.</li> <li>2. The paper discusses QFT aspects of the SM. The analysis relies on well-established physical properties that are found in well-known textbooks - [2,3,5] of the revised version. This is the main part of the literature that is used by the paper. Here is just one description of [2]: "... an impressively lucid and thorough presentation of the subject ... Weinberg manages to present difficult topics with richness of meaning and marvellous clarity. Full of valuable insights, his treatise is sure to become a classic, doing for quantum field theory what Dirac's Quantum Mechanics did for quantum mechanics. I eagerly await the publication of the second volume.' see <a href="https://www.bookdepository.com/The-Quantum-Theory-of-Fields-Foundations-Volume-1-Steven-Weinberg/9780521670531?redirected=true&amp;utm_medium=Google&amp;utm_campaign=Base5&amp;utm_source=IL&amp;utm_content=The-Quantum-Theory-of-Fields-Foundations-Volume-1&amp;selectCurrency=IL&amp;w=AFF9AU9SG7DHZPA80TCB&amp;pdg=aud-298410631622:pla-309308959119:kwd-309308959119:cmp-1348818631:adg-50951271061:crv-263323334808:pid-9780521670531:dev-c&amp;qclid=EA1a1QobChMIquuU5IHG4wIVx7HtCh3FRAPkEAQYASABEqJ3XPD_BwE">https://www.bookdepository.com/The-Quantum-Theory-of-Fields-Foundations-Volume-1-Steven-Weinberg/9780521670531?redirected=true&amp;utm_medium=Google&amp;utm_campaign=Base5&amp;utm_source=IL&amp;utm_content=The-Quantum-Theory-of-Fields-Foundations-Volume-1&amp;selectCurrency=IL&amp;w=AFF9AU9SG7DHZPA80TCB&amp;pdg=aud-298410631622:pla-309308959119:kwd-309308959119:cmp-1348818631:adg-50951271061:crv-263323334808:pid-9780521670531:dev-c&amp;qclid=EA1a1QobChMIquuU5IHG4wIVx7HtCh3FRAPkEAQYASABEqJ3XPD_BwE</a> . The reference section comprises more than 20 references. Nobody, except this reviewer, says that these references are poor. Furthermore, other reviewers did not say this and some of which have suggested few constructive remarks on this issue.</li> <li>3. The paper is far from being short and its discussion part takes a proportional length.</li> <li>4. The paper proves erroneous points of the SM. This reviewer does not show even a single specific fault of these proofs. It means that he (at least implicitly) agrees with the paper's proofs. Thus, referring to this remark of the reviewer, the SM stands for what he describes as "previous works", and my results stand for themselves. Hence, his request is already answered.</li> </ol> <p>In general, I see no <i>specific</i> argument in this review which shows a flaw in my paper. The absence of this vital element means that this review provides no acceptable reason for changing the form of the manuscript.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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