Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_128778**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Universal Constants and the Scaling Law**
Type of the Article	**Short communication**

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**Importance of the Manuscript: This manuscript proposes an innovative framework—the Unified Scalar Resonance Model (USRM)—that reimagines spacetime as a dynamic scalar field, potentially unifying quantum mechanics, gravity, and cosmic structure. By addressing unresolved issues such as dark matter, dark energy, and gravitational anomalies, it opens avenues for significant advancements in physics. The model's emphasis on intrinsic scalar field dynamics offers a fresh perspective that could influence theoretical physics and experimental exploration alike.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Suitability of Title: The title is appropriate as it directly reflects the central theme of the manuscript. However, a more descriptive title such as "Unified Scalar Resonance Model: Exploring Universal Constants and Scaling Laws" might capture the breadth of the discussion more effectively.**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive and succinctly highlights the objectives, methodology, and significance of the research. Minor improvements can be made by clarifying how the constants (α, β, γ) quantitatively influence observed phenomena. Including specific predictions or empirical validations in the abstract would enhance its impact.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**Scientific Correctness:** The manuscript is scientifically robust and grounded in established theoretical frameworks, such as general relativity and quantum mechanics, while proposing novel extensions. The equations and principles are presented coherently. However, the derivations of some results, particularly the quantized scaling laws, require more detailed explanation for broader accessibility and validation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**References:** The references are sufficient and recent, including seminal works and contemporary studies. However, adding experimental studies or observational data supporting the absence of dark matter and energy, as suggested by the USRM, would strengthen the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**Language/English Quality:** The language is scholarly and precise. Minor grammatical errors and repetitive phrasing (e.g., recurring descriptions of the constants) could be streamlined for improved readability.	
Optional/General comments	**Optional/General Comments**: The manuscript's visualization, particularly the figures illustrating scalar field patterns, adds value but could benefit from enhanced clarity (e.g., labeled axes and more detailed legends). Additionally, a comparative analysis of USRM's predictions with other models could reinforce the manuscript's claims. The manuscript demonstrates significant potential to advance the field. Addressing the suggestions above—such as expanding the derivation of results, incorporating additional empirical support, and improving figure clarity—will ensure the manuscript reaches its full impact.	

PART 2:

	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)***
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ruud Loeffen**
Department, University & Country	**Zuyd University, Netherlands**