

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_95881
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Number of Entangled Photons on Number of Coincidences, Bell's values S and Error Rate Using Delphi Program
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1) Yes. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. It discusses an important topic of current interest. It can add some value if reworked appropriately. 2) Yes. The title of the article is suitable. 3) Yes. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, it should be formatted to be within a single paragraph without sections. 4) No. The structure, sections, and subsections of the manuscript need substantial rework. The section on simulations should be expanded and elaborated given more prominence. 5) Yes. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the section on simulations should be expanded and elaborated given more prominence. 6) Yes. The references are sufficient and recent. Adding a reference to "An introduction to entanglement measures" (https://arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0504163.pdf) may be useful.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript has some grammatical and punctuation errors, which should be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs some rework as stated above.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lalit A Patel
Department, University & Country	USA