

FOOP-D-16-00168 - Submission Confirmation

Foundations of Physics (FOOP) <em@editorialmanager.com>

18. März 2016 um 14:39

Antwort an: "Foundations of Physics (FOOP)" <saranya.karunakaran@springer.com>

An: Gyula Imre Szasz <gyulaszasz42@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Szasz,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript, "Fundamental Principles in Physics", to Foundations of Physics.

The submission id is: FOOP-D-16-00168

Please refer to this number in any future correspondence.

If it is deemed suitable for our journal, it will be sent for peer review and we will endeavour to send you a first decision within three months

If your manuscript is not considered suitable for our journal (to be decided by the editorial board), we will let you know as soon as possible.

During the review process, you can keep track of the status of your manuscript by accessing the following web site:

<http://foop.edmgr.com/>

Your username is: Szasz

Your password is: available at this link

We are eager to improve the efficiency of manuscript review and welcome your feedback and suggestions about the reviewing process and Editorial Manager.

With kind regards,

Foundations of Physics

Open Access Option: Now that your article is undergoing the editorial and peer review process, it is the right time to think about publishing it as open access. With open access your article will become freely available to anyone worldwide and you will easily comply with open access mandates. Springer's open access scheme for this journal is called Open Choice (more information can be found on www.springer.com/openchoice). Once your article is accepted, you will be offered the option to publish through open access. So you might want to talk to your institution and funder now to see how payment could be organized; for an overview of available open access funding please go to www.springer.com/oafunding. You need take no action yet, but please be aware of the upcoming options.

FOOP-D-16-00168

Karunakaran, Saranya, Springer <Saranya.Karunakaran@springer.com>

19. März 2016 um 16:01

An: Gyula Imre Szasz <gyulaszasz42@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. Szasz,

I would like to inform you that your manuscript has been received online and the same has been assigned to the editor for initial evaluation.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,
Saranya
Saranya Karunakaran (Ms.)
JEO Assistant
Journals Editorial Office (JEO)
Springer Nature
T [+91 44 42197752](tel:+914442197752)
F [+91 44 42197763](tel:+914442197763)
Saranya.Karunakaran@springer.com
www.springernature.com

Editor's decision on FOOP-D-16-00168

Fedde Benedictus <em@editorialmanager.com>
Antwort an: Fedde Benedictus <f.j.benedictus@uu.nl>
An: Gyula Imre Szasz <gyulaszasz42@gmail.com>
Dear Dr. Szasz,

6. April 2016 um 10:12

We have received your submission FOOP-D-16-00168 entitled
"Fundamental Principles in Physics".

Before entering a submission to the reviewing process, we check whether it obeys criteria such as
the following:

- Is the topic of research suitable for this journal?
- Does the paper contain original ideas and new results?
- Are the arguments and calculations accurate and correct?
- Is the exposition sufficiently well organized, and worded well?
- Does the overall quality agree with our very tough standards?

I regret to inform you that the editors had to conclude that this work is not suitable for publication in
Foundations of Physics.

I would like to thank you very much for forwarding your manuscript to us for consideration.

With kind regards,

Fedde Benedictus
Managing Editor
Foundations of Physics

Dear Fedde Benedictus,

I am objection again the decision of the editors. Please give me a detailed description for the rejection in lights of my arguments:

The following central problems of physics are solved through my new theory.

- The origin of the masses of particles is cleared up.
- The gravitational and the inertial masses are different.
- Also the gravitation is installed in particle physics.
- Only the electromagnetism and the gravitation exist as interactions between the particles.
- Only the sources of the interaction fields are quantized.
- Only the four stable elementary particles electron (e), positron (p), proton (P) and elton (E) exist. (Elton = "antiproton"),
- The elementary particle have two kinds of conserved charges $q_i = \{\pm e\}$ and $g_i = \{\pm g \cdot m_i\}$, $i = e, p, P, E$.
- The masses of electron (e) and proton (P), m_e and m_p are elementary masses.
- The universal gravitational constant is $G = g^2/4\pi$.
- A principle uncertainty is valid for the positions and the velocities of particles.
- The interaction is non-conservative and propagates with c.
- The action integral for fields and particles is defined.
- The equations of motions of fields and particles are derived.
- The stationary states of particle systems correspond not with energy eigenvalues.
- All stable and instable particles are composed of e, p, P and E.
- The Universe is built up from four elementary particles and two fundamental fields.
- The laws of nature are non-deterministic, but causal.

The Atomistic Theory of Matter follows from these statements; the matter is built up from for the stable elementary particles e, p, P and E. The currently developed energetic physics led not to desired results.

The physics has to control all the prognoses of the new theory and if they are all confirmed we would have a Theory of Everything (TOE).

Dear Fedde Benedictus,

the *Fundamental Principles in Physics*, **FOOP-D-16-00168**, lead to the following Atomistic Theory of Matter, enclosed in my paper.

Please, regard your decision once more.

Sincerely,

Gyula I. Szász

Dear Fedde Benedictus,

you has checked whether the paper obeys criteria such as the following:

- Is the topic of research suitable for this journal?

Yes, the journal **Foundation of Physics** is a suitable journal for the publication of a topic with the title of Fundamental Principles in Physics. Which other journal would be more suitable?

- Does the paper contain original ideas and new results?

Yes, the paper contains very original ideas and important new results. On the first place should be mentioned, that the origin of the masses of particles are cleared up and Newton's equation of motion in the gravitational field is enhanced.

- Are the arguments and calculations accurate and correct?

Yes, the scientific arguments are comprehensive, the mathematical calculations are accurate and corrects.

- Is the exposition sufficiently well organized, and worded well?

Yes, the exposition is well organized: At first the currently used physical postulates are critically considered, then the new basic postulates are written down, after that the concrete physical realization was performed founded on the new basic principles, until the derivation of equations of motions for the fields and the particles. At the end, a conclusion is drawn for the physical descriptions.

- Does the overall quality agree with our very tough standards?

I think, yes! Which overall quality, which tough standards are violated?

Please, explain me in detail, Mr. Benedictus, on which basics has the editorial staff decided the rejection of the paper? You did not list any (acceptable) arguments.

Has anybody of the staff read really the paper?

Sincerely,

Gyula I. Szász

FOOP-D-16-00168

Karunakaran, Saranya, Springer <Saranya.Karunakaran@springer.com>
An: Gyula Imre Szasz <gyulaszasz42@gmail.com>

12. April 2016 um 16:54

Dear Dr. Szász,

Please find below the response of the editor for your perusal:

" Please inform the author that his manuscript will not be reconsidered, and that, due to a very heavy workload, we cannot afford to correspond about rejected manuscripts."

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Saranya

Saranya Karunakaran (Ms.), JEO Assistant, Journals Editorial Office (JEO)

"Countries across the globe invest tens of billions in particle physics, which relies on the Standard Model. This model is styled by its proponents as "the most accurate theory in history, in any field." The paper of Gy. I. Szász presents a series of failures found with the basics of theory: its inability to explain basic phenomena known since the 1900s; its prediction of particles and materials that have refused to be uncovered even in lunar rocks; the growing recognition that basic assumptions underlying the model are incorrect."

Gyula I. Szász