SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Physical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_PSIJ_10312**
Title of the Manuscript:	**On the Problem of Reduction of the State's Vector**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
To be honest, for me it still is not clear the following. The author considers the wave function φ for the screen as a whole, so φ is the wave function of the screen, not an atom. The screen has the length L but the wave function has the width Δx (by the way, as I noted before, in line 111 it should be x > L/N, not x > L). So the impression is that almost all atoms of the screen are within Δx, right? However, since the screen is not a liquid, the usual understanding is that its atoms can make only small oscillations. I think that almost all readers will have this impression. The author has decided not to explain this point. I think that the role of the referee is only to indicate points which might be unclear and it is for the author to decide whether the referee remarks are valuable or not.	Of course, x > L/N (my mistake) I came back to my old opinion that atoms of the screen shouldn't be localized anywhere. But discussion with honoured reviewer helped me to clarify my model of the screen. I rewrite the end of Discussion (202-206). Now it looks as "...the wave function of the screen Φ in the form (4) corresponds to superposition of Φ_n which are the eigenfunctions of screen atoms with mass m considered as non-interacting particles putting in square box with infinite depth. This is very crude model of the screen and its application may be approved only as first approximation to the problem. So localization of Φ doesn't need localization of Φ_n I express my gratitude to reviewer for discussion and apologize for hesitation