



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_26365
Title of the Manuscript:	Geodetic Precession under the Paradigm of a Cosmic Membrane
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 manuscript is about an application of the membrane theory of gravity developed by Stefan von Weber. It is concerned with geodesic precession and the Gravity probe B experiment.</p> <p>Before commenting on this manuscript it should be mentioned that the theory of Weber is rather controversial and far outside the main stream of physics today.</p> <p>There are some interesting calculations in this manuscript, but also some controversial passages that should either be removed or changed before the paper is eventually published.</p> <p>In connection with inertial dragging, which does not exist according to Weber's theory, only the Gravity probe B experiment is discussed, but not the more accurate Lageos I and II experiment. See for example the article by Ciufolini I Nature: http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v449/n7158/full/nature06071.html</p> <p>This experiment should also be discussed in the present manuscript.</p> <p>The lines from 460 to 471 are misleading and should either be</p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for his comment, especially for the hint to the LAGEOS missions. We accept the LAGEOS results and cite the paper of Ciufolini as an important proof of the existence of the frame-dragging effect. We revise some controversial passages and remove some. In the new section 'conclusions' we articulate the conflict between our critics of the GBP results and the results of the LAGEOS missions for a scientific discussion and as a base for further research.</p> <p>We revise this rows.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>reformulated and removed. The text here is not correct. The Lense Thirring Effect is not based upon any assumption about how gravity is propagated. It is a purely classical theory.</p> <p>Also in my opinion the author's writing about absolute space and motion is misleading. Our motion through the cosmic microwave radiation is a motion relative to the frame in which these sources are on the average at rest, i.e. where the radiation is isotropic. Hence it is a relative motion.</p> <p>Furthermore I think it would be a great advantage for the author's chance of having his theory discussed by present physicists, to free himself of conceptions that place the theory far outside the main stream physics. If his theory is not taken seriously, it will be rapidly forgotten.</p>	<p>We add a remark to assure the reader that CM theory is also a relativity theory very near to GR theory.</p> <p>We agree. We hope that the publication of the paper results in a helpful discussion. CM theory has in the dark matter field some interesting offers.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		