SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Physical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_PSIJ_11144**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Computational Solution to Quantum Foundational Problems**
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/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	-	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	(1) I found this paper very nicely presented, styled, and written. (2) Since I am not an expert on computational complexity theory, I found it difficult to judge step-by-step correctness of the paper's content. (3) I feel that the paper implies that equations of laws of physics must be solvable within a certain computational complexity level. I think this is like saying that a house-owner must hide house keys only in such a way that an intruder should be in a position to locate the hidden house keys. I do not find any reason for laws of physics to abide by a certain computational complexity requirement. (4) I found this paper posted at http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7686 . (5) I found paper's comment by Scott Aaronson's at http://www.scottaaronson.com/blog/?p=1767#comme : a. I can confirm that it's complete garbage. The author is simply mistaken that solving the Schrödinger equation is "NP-complete" in any interesting sense: his argument for that seems to rely on a rediscovery of the adiabatic algorithm, but he doesn't mention that the spectral gap could be exponentially small (and hence the annealing time could be exponentially large)—the central problem that's been the bane of Farhi and his collaborators (and, of course, of D-Wave) for the past 15 years. … Also, even	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	if you thought (for totally mistaken reasons) that quantum mechanics let you solve NP-complete problems in polynomial time, that might (or might not) suggest to you that quantum mechanics should be replaced by something else. But until you'd actually found a replacement, and given some sort of evidence for its truth, I don't see how you could claim to have thereby "solved the measurement problem"!! … As additional problems, the author appears to conflate the P vs. NP problem with the question of whether NP-complete problems can be efficiently solved in the physical world, a common novice mistake. And also, he seems comically unaware of everything that's been discovered in quantum computing theory over the past 20 years relevant to the issues he's writing about—as if he just emerged from a cave.' (6) If I were to accept Scott Aaronson as an expert on the subject matter of this paper, I feel that publication of this paper in this journal may harm this journal's credibility. (7) I think that the subject matter of this paper is too specialized and outside the scope of this journal.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Lalit A Patel**
Department, University & Country	**USA**