SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Physical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_PSIJ_28188**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Critical comment on the paper "Some of the Complexities in the Special relativity: New paradoxes"**
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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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 need to include more details from [Artecha, et al.] regarding the twin coeval paradox. Along with an explanation an equation that can be directly contradicted would be ideal. Strictly within the realm of SR, this paper 'Comments' appears to have a valid argument and supporting calculations. However, it is necessary to make sure that the authors' rebuttal of [Artecha, et al.] is referring to the correct paradox.**	
Minor REVISION comments	A stronger conclusion that includes a restatement of the hypothesis and results would be an improvement.	
Optional/General comments	As a matter of style, it is suggested that exposition on "putative paradoxes" could be reduced.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sean Wade**
Department, University & Country	**Highmount, NY, USA**