



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_64531
Title of the Manuscript:	About the Origin of the Dark Energy and the Zero Mass/Energy Universe
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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>There are many questions to the author(s) because the manuscript is badly structured. The general idea is understood – to show that gravitational equations could be practically the same by structure as the equation of electromagnetic field. Nevertheless, no correct definition of such notion as mass; besides. The author(s) introduces both positive and negative masses; what are they?</p> <p>In electrodynamics we can measure E and B. But what can we measure in the approach presented by the author(s)? They are the gravito-eielectric flux density (d, or g) and gravito-magnetic flux density (b, or h)?? Is any fact of the measurement?</p> <p>Mass deferential dm appears as a differential of dr with some factors. Why?</p> <p>The author(s) wishes to reduce the Dark Energy in the universe to the introduced parameter $w_g = 2 \cdot (4 \cdot \gamma \cdot \mathbf{g}^2 + \eta \cdot \mathbf{h}^2)$. Then one can raise the question: Do you observe something similar in the field of electromagnetic phenomena, which can be described by the equation $w_e = (\epsilon \cdot \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu \cdot \mathbf{H}^2) / 2$?</p> <p>The section Conclusion continues to represent some ideas and their development buy the author(s). I cannot see any real structural presentation of the results obtained and some real conclusion.</p> <p>I think the manuscript has to be rewritten from the beginning. The author(s) must seriously revise the manuscript.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Volodymyr Krasnoholovets
Department, University & Country	Ukraine