Review of: "A Study on the Absolute Stationary Inertial Frame and the Relative Velocity, Inertia Mass, Momentum and Kinetic Energy in the Inertial Frame moving relative to it"

Usamah Al-Ali[1]

1 Saudi Electronic University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper aims to make a paradigm shift as it challenges the assumptions and implications of one of the most successful theories in the history of science. While it has been confirmed in a countless number of experiments that the laws of physics are the same for every observer regardless of his frame of reference, the issue of the existence of an absolute stationary frame is still controversial and a subject of debate among few scientists even though it invalidates the principle of Relativity!

In my opinion, the assumption in which the paper is based creates some troubles as it contradicts the well-established fact that there is no preferred frame of reference in Physics which is what Special Relativity theory is all about. Therefore, the assumption of the existence of such frame requires reasonable justification which the author fails to provide in this paper.

Nevertheless, if we try to visualize the existence of such frame theoretically or in the actual physical world, we might face some troubles that I personally don't know how to avoid. For example, one might be tempted to consider the comoving reference frame (the frame of Cosmic Microwave Background radiations CMB) as an absolute stationary reference frame for the universe but any knowledgeable cosmologist knows very well that this frame is not qualified as absolute in any physical sense of the word. The other option is to construct a theoretical (mathematical) absolute stationary reference frame but in this case we are actually adding unnecessary complexity to our understanding of the universe. Therefore, from the standpoint of Ocam's razor, the assumption at best, is not needed. So I believe that neither physical justifications nor logical reasoning support such assumption.

Nonetheless, if the author insists on the validity of his assumption, I think he has to add few paragraphs to justify it. Another point, I would like to raise, is about the first statement in the introduction where the author states that "Albert Einstein derived the equations for time dilation, mass increase, and kinetic energy in the theory of special relativity published in 1905…etc". This is not accurate from historical point of view as Lorentz is the one who derived the mentioned equations. Einstein's contribution was to provide the right interpretations for Lorentz equations but he was not the one who first introduced them in literature.

In general, the paper is well-organized and there is no issue with the calculations but I think the author has to convince the reader of the validity of his assumption by providing some justifications. Also, I suggest that the author indicates the contribution of Lorentz in deriving the equations of Special Relativity in the first statement of the introduction.