



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_PRRI_3363
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantum Gravity and the Holographic Mass.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The author defined the holographic mass and applied it to the black hole and the proton. There are some interesting coincidences, e.g. similarity with strong force and Yukawa potential in short range in the study. However, There are still some questions to be answered: 1)The meaning of holographic principle(HP) is definitely not that used in the paper. Moreover, the area in Eq.(4) should be surface area. Generally, HP is no problem when used in black holes, but it is problematic when used in the weak gravitational field. How to guarantee its validity when used in the system of protons? 2) The black hole mass and proton mass were obtained from different formula (Eq. 9 and Eq. 24), although they were explained in holographic principle. Why? 3) The author described a system in section5 to use the gravitational interaction to explain the strong force. Where could we see the evidence of gluon? Or does the gluon derived from the evolution of graviton? 4) For the system consisted of two protons, there indeed are many coincidences. But if they cannot be extended into other systems, e.g. three protons etc., the phenomena described in the paper is not enough to support their conclusion.</p> <p>In a word, the conclusions obtained in the paper are highly implicative in the physical mechanism. However, it is interesting to understand further these coincidences found by the author. The paper is not</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	proper to be published in the present form.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer