



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_40365
Title of the Manuscript:	Industrial Sustainability and the Circular Economy as Counterparts to the Self-Referral Mechanics of Natural Law: Part I—A Theoretical Foundation
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	i. In Sec.2, the author concentrated only on CE or PE, but the atmospheric impact out of industrial processes are not been seriously addressed. Even in certain places the author has perplexed with materialistic (economics) and energetic (atomic, molecular or subatomic) phenomenon of nature, which is quite contradictory to <i>Rig Veda and Gita</i>.	The authors do not believe that a discussion of “atmospheric impact out of industrial processes” is within the scope of this paper.
Minor REVISION comments	ii. The author quoted many authors in the field of consciousness but left the giant scientific philosophers, Shri. Rajnish “Osho” and Dr. T. D. Singh, “Prabupadha”, Founder, ISCON, who have given more scientific explanation to such conceptual discussion of Veda & Vedic Literature. iii. The continuum, mandala concept of Maharishi explained by the authors with the pictorial representation of <i>Katha Upanishad</i> pointing <i>Atma</i>, <i>Devas</i> and <i>Brahm</i> explores the colourful beauty of nature in the context of arrangement of nanoparticles in the feathers of peacock, butterfly, etc.; the natures colourful creations., rather than the fundamental interactions (Fig.1) iv. The scientific explanation for TM-<i>sidhi</i>, introduced by Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, in the context of EM waves may add more flavor to this manuscript. v. The author has eluded in many places by not explaining his quoted paradigm, for eg., the storage of nuclear waste materials, Nuclear technology as non-viable source of energy, etc. vi. A tint of surface reading of <i>Panchama Vedas</i> is visible wherever <i>Veda</i> is quoted in the manuscript. Sanskrit words inserted between words make the manuscript seems to be, more Veda oriented. Since this manuscript is mainly focused on Maharishi Mahesh Yogi's Vedic Science, the author may include the original Sanskrit texts in the manuscript. vii. The author appreciates the unified theory but at the other end opposes nuclear technology, which is quite contrary even though the manuscript is written on the soul basis of Maharishi Mahesh Yogi's Vedic science.	This paper concerns the perspective of Maharishi on Natural Law and Vedic Science; the authors acknowledge that other perspectives are possible but also maintain that they are outside the scope of the present paper It is not clear to these authors what the reviewer is getting at here; Figure 1 does not refer to Katha Upanishad, feathers of a peacock or butterfly. The authors are not sure what the reviewer is getting at here; we assume EM stands for “electro-magnetic” but we are not sure what this has to do with the TM-Sidhi program. The authors do not understand what the reviewer means by “eluded in many places”. The authors have added the relevant Sanskrit text where appropriate. However, it is not within the scope of this paper to “include the original Sanskrit text in the manuscript” beyond the brief references already contained; we do not understand the reference to “Panchama Vedas” being visible as a “tint of surface reading”. The authors do not believe there is an incompatibility with unified field theory and nuclear technology; one is a theory the other is a technology. While there may be a relationship between unified field theory and nuclear technology, the two are completely different issues. We therefore do not see an contradiction.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	viii. Since the focus of this manuscript mainly on Industry and Economy the inclusion of pure basic science terms diluted the core of then paper. A strong analytical approach towards Natural Law, seems to be an utmost necessary. I appreciate the author for his vast analysis of literatures in the well-studied field of ‘sustainability’. And I recommend this paper for publication after incorporating the above said suggestions.	The authors believe they have taken a “strong analytical approach toward Natural Law” and do not see how basic terms of science have “diluted the core then paper”.
----------------------------------	---	---