SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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 the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**There is nothing new in this paper which repeats and retrieves the following well-known facts about quantum mechanics:** **i) The dynamical variables of quantum mechanics cannot all be defined simultaneously with infinite accuracy.** **ii) An orthodox quantum theory does not specify whether an object plus apparatus system undergoes a deterministic transformation in accordance with Schrodinger's time-dependent equation or whether it undergoes a probabilistic transformation associated with the reduction of wave- packets. It is this inability of the orthodox quantum theory to specify precisely such mutually exclusive conditions that lies at the root of insolubility of the measurement problem. The immense diversity of opinions and the endless variety of theories concerning quantum measurements are but a reflection of the fundamental disagreement as to the interpretation of quantum mechanics as the whole.** **iii) Schrodinger' time-dependent equation or the Heisenberg's formulation or the concept of quantum probability is not applicable to a macroscopic system because any effort to apply any of these quantum formalisms to a typical macroscopic system (like the apparatus) causes to many other controversies and insurmountable paradoxes besides the existence of**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	mathematical entities that are incapable of being computed by any deterministic algorithm in a finite time. **Furthermore, there are several typographical errors and grammatical mistakes in this paper and some uncommon, rather meaningless, phrases, like 'non-local in general magnitudes'; 'with the a priori probabilities'; and ' intuitionistic interpretation' have been used.** **In view of these comments, this paper cannot be recommended for publication in its present form. It is suggested that this paper should be revised, rather rewritten, removing these lacunas and precisely mentioning the specific contribution of the author(s), if any. Before revising this paper, the attention of the author(s) may be drawn toward the following recent papers written to resolve the difficulties encountered in the non-statistical interpretation of wave function:** **B.S. Rajput, Can. J. Phys. 89 (2011)185-191;** **Journ. Mod. Phys. 3(9) (2012) 989-8**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Paper should be thoroughly revised, rather rewritten.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Balwant Singh Rajput***
Department, University & Country	***Physics, Kumaun University, India***