



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_24990
Title of the Manuscript:	Kaluza-Klein Bouncing Cosmological Model in General Relativity
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	This paper contains significant errors. The proposed ansatz (Eq. (6)) has inconsistent dimensions ($(t-t_0)^2$ has the dimensions of time squared, $t_0/(1-\beta)$ has the dimensions of time.) The proposed ansatz is NOT a solution of the field equations (6)–(8), as can be determined easily by direct substitution. The acceleration parameter is defined incorrectly (17). It can be seen already from dimensional arguments, as the Hubble constant has dimensions of inverse time, so Eq. (17) contains both dimensionless quantities and quantities with the dimensions of inverse time squared. But it can also be checked by direct substitution, using the definition of H (10). The correct form of the acceleration parameter is $q = -1 - \dot{H}/H^2$, as can be verified by direct calculation. Because these fundamental errors invalidate any discussion of the model's physical properties, I am not commenting on Sec. 4 at the present time. These errors MUST be corrected if the authors choose to resubmit this paper for further consideration.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is obvious that the authors are not native speakers of English. I strongly recommend that the paper be reviewed by a native speaker before resubmission.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada