



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_31668
Title of the Manuscript:	Explaining the Born rule in the intuitionistic interpretation of quantum mechanics
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The revised version of this paper is almost the same as its original form and it has not been revised as per suggestions given in my earlier review report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree with the response of the author on my comments given in my earlier review report about the problems of quantum measurements and the applicability of the Schrodinger's equation for a macroscopic system (including the object and the apparatus). Regarding the claim of the author about the absence of typing errors in the manuscript, I may mention the following typographical/ grammatical mistakes in the text of the paper; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence in the fourth paragraph on page-2: 'But then again, it hard to see-----' In the first sentence of third paragraph on page-7: ' --postulating the the universal---' In the second sentence on page -9: ' ---does not have an a priori logical value-----' In last sentence of fourth paragraph: '-----inasmuch as----' and several other similar typographical/ grammatical errors in the text. <p>Thus none of the suggestion/ comment given in my earlier review report has been considered in the revised version (rather resubmission of the same earlier version).</p>	<p>Once more time, I would like to thank the reviewer for the profound and thoughtful analysis of my manuscript.</p> <p>Regarding the reviewer's new comments, I would like to say in response the following:</p> <p><u>To the comments ## 1</u></p> <p>I understand that the reviewer does not share the explanation of the origin of quantum probability presented in the manuscript. However, the point is whether the presented explanation is mathematically sound and scientifically meaningful or not. If not, I would like to see a critique listing such critical flaws of the manuscript. If yes, in my opinion, the manuscript merits publication.</p> <p><u>To the comments ## 2</u></p> <p>I fixed all the typos mentioned (or not) by the reviewer, please observe the final draft of the manuscript.</p> <p>Again, I am very grateful for the reviewer's time and consideration.</p>