



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>                |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_PSIJ_24990</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Kaluza-Klein Bouncing Cosmological Model in General Relativity</b> |
| 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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>When I first scanned this article, I noticed the size of the references. Clearly this was going to be a significant effort. However, I was surprised about the size of the abstract. First, don't reference an article in the abstract. Second, what did you do, how did you do it, and why is the paper worth reading. You should say it was assumed that the fluid was perfect and then give me a reason for the bottom-line on the paper... It looks interesting but should have been extended to 150-200 words.</p> <p>In the introduction, the author mentioned novae and all sorts of interesting items. This should have been mentioned in the abstract. In the first paragraph, the author skims over about 20 references. You should mention some of the key findings of these papers. At this point, one wonders how seriously was reviewing the reference review. For example, did the author find topics related to this subject and included it for the paper rather than actually looking at it? Have not heard 'bouncing universe' and what is EoS?</p> <p>Review after number 29 are excellent. and the fifth coordinate <math>\varphi</math> is taken to be space-like should have mentioned that the Kaluza-</p> |   |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p><b>Klein fifth dimension...</b></p> <p>Equation 11 has a format problem on Z....<br/>recent observations of SN Ia (Reiss SN is what? Same thing about DP...<br/>The field equations (6) to (8) From my perspective, I would have assumed the field equations are (5) but I could be wrong...<br/>The motivation to choose such scale factor is behind the fact that the universe is accelerated<br/>120 expansion at present and decelerated expansion in the past. Would it be wise to show this as a graph versus time?<br/>What is the values on the scale for fig. 1? Is this what I am requesting?<br/>What is the value of beta? You never really say anything...</p> |  |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments                   |  |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments<br>See below... |  |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>P. A. Murad</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Morningstar Applied Physics, LLC, Institute of Atmospheric Physics of RAS, Moscow, 119017, Russia</b> |