



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_62203
Title of the Manuscript:	Refutation of the quantum theory principles: Theorem
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I would like to firstly congratulate the authors for the outstanding work. In fact, their knowledge about the scientific topic is far superior to mine, so I feel comfortable to only provide some suggestions in order to improve the quality of reading and to make it more easily comprehended by those not familiar. Then, it is not a problem for me if the Editor considers that other more relevant opinions are required to judge this paper.</p> <p>My first point is in relation to the discussion about the quantum axioms. It seems to me that the authors question the Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, which stands for the impossibility of simultaneously assessing position and velocity. Since I work with instrumentation, this particular point called my intention, because we face a real difficult situation here: every instrument presents an inherent sensitivity and limit of detection (LOD), and a particular challenge is to increase these limit ranges. I have not yet read about any system capable of assessing in a subatomic level, therefore, I want to ask if the authors already seen something or can imagine how it would be possible to experimentally prove that this was simply a postulate that helped us in the absence of better and more complete theories.</p> <p>On the other hand, it is already well known from ultrafast spectroscopic studies the presence of intermediate states: after absorbing a photon, a fluorophore reaches an excited state with increased polarity, allowing the solvent molecules to reorganize themselves, and then may emit in a red-shift or even only decay by non-radiative mechanisms, so the statement regarding the presence of the intermediate state seems to be correct.</p> <p>Another point is that it was not clear to me the relation between the quantum mechanics and the fluidomechanical theory expressed by continuity equation. I think that a small initial sentence explaining the relation between them could improve the quality of paper, making it "more accessible".</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is very well written in grammar terms. Personally, I do not like to write everything in 1st-person, and in a journalistic language, engaging the reader, but I believe it is not only the stylish of the authors, but also a way to "call the responsibility". The authors initiate the paper with a very strong title, which of course can result in strong discussions. Therefore, by using the first person, the authors show that they know the possibilities, but these are their conclusions.</p> <p>A simple final point is that the paper Abstract appears to indicate that there are experimental results presented. Then, I would kindly suggest adjusting it in order to remove this little ambiguity.</p>	<p>I again would like to state that the knowledge of authors regarding the topic is much superior than mine. I only feel comfortable, then, to suggest small modifications to let the reading more "accessible" and there is no problem if the editors believe that more reviewers should be contacted.</p> <p>This paper presents an outstanding quality regarding the language, the references and the knowledge demonstrated by authors.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marco César Prado Soares
Department, University & Country	University of Campinas, Brazil