



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_28188
Title of the Manuscript:	Critical comment on the paper "Some of the Complexities in the Special relativity: New paradoxes"
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The authors need to include more details from [Artecha, et al.] regarding the twin coeval paradox. Along with an explanation an equation that can be directly contradicted would be ideal. Strictly within the realm of SR, this paper 'Comments' appears to have a valid argument and supporting calculations. However, it is necessary to make sure that the authors' rebuttal of [Artecha, et al.] is referring to the correct paradox.	(page 2) The authors of [5] start their description of would be 'paradox of coevals': "Since a change of time course is declared in the SRT...". This statement is fatally misleading. No changing of time course is declared in the SRT. On the contrary, SRT declare just one unite spacetime and many different viewpoints around it. (page 5) In this way we are persuaded that the reasoning of authors about so called 'paradox of coevals' flies on the face of basic relativistic equations – Lorentz transformation formulae. The paradox of coevals does not exist... (My objection) In the section "Introduction" I say about a real (not imaginary!) paradox – Triplet. And in the section "Conclusion" I underline the correct reference to it.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	A stronger conclusion that includes a restatement of the hypothesis and results would be an improvement.	(Conclusion, page 7) As it has been shown above, all the 'complexities in the SRT' supposedly leading to 'new paradoxes' are nothing else as consequences of misinterpreted relativistic notions and negligent appliance of relativistic formalism. The main feature of the relativistic philosophy is an intransigent acceptance of ontologically united spacetime. It may be slivered for space and time by innumerable quantity of ways depending on the character of an observer motion, and each of them is right.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	As a matter of style, it is suggested that exposition on "putative paradoxes" could be reduced.	This is out my remit. It would be more relevant for the authors themselves to abridge the list.