

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org

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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international



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 authors suggest an alternative explanation for	
	the geodetic and, perhaps, frame-dragging effects of	
	General Relativity. Their approach is sober and in the	
	context of a model developed previously by them	
	(Cosmic Membrane Theory). I think the paper is	
	interesting and discloses some problems in the	
	interpretation of the results for Gravity Probe B	
	experiment.	
	•	
	Some remarks:	
	1) The change of velocity of the speed of light in a gravitational field is a concept already used in some alternative models to GR. Even Einstein played with it before proposing GR in its final form. I suggest that the authors should check:	
	R. H. Dicke, "Gravitation without a principle of equivalence", Rev. Mod. Phys. 29, 363-376 (1957)	
	And	
	H. E. Puthoff, "Polarizable-Vacuum approach to GR", Found. of Physics, 32 (6) , 2002.	
	for a theory based on the spatial variations of	
	the vacuum electric and magnetic	

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

	permeabilities.	
	These works should be cited.	
	In the last section a contribution to the East-West precession is discloses as the geodetic effect caused by the Sun.	
	Does the authors think than an enhanced geodetic effect in their model could fit the experimental data for GPB both for the North-South and East-West observed precessions within the error bars ?	
	Perhaps using a slightly different parameter K in the CM model. Add some discussion on this topic.	
Minor REVISION comments	I think the authors should use E (capital E) for energy and G for the gravitational constant instead of "e" and "gamma". Their notation may be confusing for some readers because, usually, "e" stands for the unit of charge and "gamma" for the Lorentz factor.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Acedo Rodríguez
Department, University & Country	Instituto Universitario de Matemática Multidisciplinar, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Valencia,
	Spain