



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_60357
Title of the Manuscript:	Information Content of the Model for Calculating the Finite Precision of Measurements
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1) Abstract is not properly written. It should have a conventional format that is commonly used in scientific community. Moreover, the abstract should show the key quantitative results obtained in this study.</p> <p>2) The style of writing especially at the beginning of Introduction is very unconventional. It is not a proper way to mix "a quark, the universe, neurons, love and hate, the coronavirus, sound, the smell of a rose" together.</p> <p>3) The sentences like: "In other words, the set of 100 musical notes played by chimpanzees will have exactly the same amount of information as that of the 100 notes played by Mozart in his Piano Concerto No. 21 (Andante movement)" causes confusion if this work a serious scientific contribution.</p> <p>4) The sentence: "Thus, we can introduce the postulate of a priori equiprobability (maximum low predictability) of the appearance of any FIQ in the model." Is it an attempt to claim that this as a new philosophical postulate?</p> <p>5) There is no logical links between Introduction, aim and sections 4 and 5 containing a large list of irrelevant formulas.</p>	<p>1) The Abstract should be reorganized accordingly</p> <p>2) The author(s) should follow conventional way in writing a serious scientific paper.</p> <p>3) A scientific paper should avoid these comparisons.</p> <p>4) I am not sure about objective of this paper.</p> <p>5) Logical links are missing.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be rejected.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanjar Abrarov
Department, University & Country	York University, Canada