



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRR1_3745
Title of the Manuscript:	Form of nonequilibrium statistical operator, thermodynamic flows and entropy production

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Referee report on revised 2013-PRRI-3745 "Form of nonequilibrium statistical operator, thermodynamic flows and entropy production", by V.V.Ryazanov, submitted to Physical Review Research International The author does not answer satisfactorily any my question or remark. From the formal point of view the paper is not well written. I think that the paper cannot be published in the Physical Review Research International. Nevertheless, in the following there are some remarks and suggestions. 1.) Any new physical theory should satisfy the correspondence principle of physics. Therefore, in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ the non-equilibrium statistical operator with the distribution function $p_q(t)$ should recover the non-equilibrium statistical operator which satisfies the Liouville equation without sources. To prove this the author should demonstrate the Abel's theorem for arbitrary function $p_q(t)$: $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^0 f(t) dt = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow +0} \int_{-\infty}^0 p_q(t) f(t) dt, \quad p_q(t) = \varphi(\epsilon, t).$ If the function $p_q(t)$ does not satisfy the Abel's theorem then the correspondence principle of physics is violated. 2.) The same should be proved for the function $p_q(u, t)$. 3.) I see the fundamental contradiction in the application of the maximum entropy principle to the explicit calculations of the distribution function $p_q(u, t)$ of the non-equilibrium statistical operator. The maximum entropy principle is related only to the equilibrium states and can not be applied to the non-equilibrium states which are described by the non-equilibrium statistical operator. Here is a contradiction. 4.) In present paper the section "Conclusion" is similar to the section "Introduction". The author's conclusions are not clearly stated. In a good "Conclusion", the author discusses the obtained results. He/She should show how his/her results agree (or contrast) with previously published works. The obtained results and the conclusions suggested by the results should be clearly stated. 5.) English of the paper should be essentially improved. The formulas should be written more accurately. The unnecessary symbols should be replaced from the formulas. I insisently recommend the author to use the LaTeX programme writing the text of the papers instead of the Word programme.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer