



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_29643
Title of the Manuscript:	The wonderful world of Hammar's experiment
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	The author resurrects (his word) Hammar's experiment on the aether entrainment. He makes a detailed description using a graveyard language. In his view, this experiment is the work of a genius that has definitively invalidated Miller's arguments on aether entrainment by mater bodies. He writes textually that the results of Hammar's experiment have "fully nailed the coffin of the theory of entrained aether". I ask me however if actually anybody has doubts about the wrongness of the aether entrainment hypothesis. Miller has made lifelong efforts to prove light anisotropy. However, his results were too small to match the expectations of the aether theories. He justified this smallness in terms of entrainment of the aether by the laboratory structures. Hammar's experiment certainly refutes Miller's explanation in terms of aether entrainment. However, does it refute Miller's light anisotropy results too, or only his explanation? Readers certainly are interested on the light anisotropy problem, however concerning the recent light anisotropy experiments with the help of the tightly synchronized atomic clocks in orbit. Atomic clocks in orbit are usually synchronized to within 0.1 ns (time for light to travel 3 cm). In the microgravity measurements with the help of the twin satellites of the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment, moving in the same polar orbit, electromagnetic signals are regularly exchanged between the twin satellites porting tightly synchronized atomic clocks. They show a clear	Dayton Miller's experiments were marred by a lot of issues. Read here: https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0608238. No mainstream physicist accepts Miller's results today. There is no valid data in Miller's experiments. Modern experiments constrain light speed anisotropy to levels of 10^{-16}. All "data" in Miller's experiment has been analyzed and refuted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	backward anisotropy of 8 km/sec in the signal velocity. The author could extend his analysis on light anisotropy to a more lively world extending his approach and including a discussion about these new observations. There are no errors or mistakes in the author's manuscript. I however strongly recommend him extending his comments somewhat beyond the "walls of the graveyard".	There is nothing to extend, your comments have been long refuted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		