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 **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 manuscript is about an application of the membrane theory of gravity developed by Stefan von Weber. It is concerned with geodesic precession and the Gravity probe B experiment. Before commenting on this manuscript it should be mentioned that the theory of Weber is rather controversial and far outside the main stream of physics today. There are some interesting calculations in this manuscript, but also some controversial passages that should either be removed or changed before the paper is eventually published. In connection with inertial dragging, which does not exist according to Weber's theory, only the Gravity probe B experiment is discussed, but not the more accurate Lageos I and II experiment. See for example the article by Ciufolini I Nature: http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v449/n7158/full/nature06071.html This experiment should also be discussed in the present manuscript. The lines from 460 to 471 are misleading and should either be	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	reformulated and removed. The text here is not correct. The Lense Thirring Effect is not based upon any assumption about how gravity is propagated. It is a purely classical theory. Also in my opinion the author's writing about absolute space and motion is misleading. Our motion through the cosmic microwave radiation is a motion relative to the frame in which these sources are on the average at rest, i.e. where the radiation is isotropic. Hence it is a relative motion. Furthermore I think it would be a great advantage for the author's chance of having his theory discussed by present physicists, to free himself of conceptions that place the theory far outside the main stream physics. If his theory is not taken seriously, it will be rapidly forgotten.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Oyvind Gron**
Department, University & Country	**Art and Design, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway**