

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_99273
Title of the Manuscript:	The Emergent Entangled Informational Universe
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. This manuscript focuses on a set of five new equivalent formulations of entropy which based on hidden thermodynamics of Louis de Broglie and the introduction to it of the mass and the physicality of information, this model explains the collapse of the wave function by the fact that a measure informs the measurer about the system to be measured and can invalidate the many worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics and the simulation hypothesis. However, the references are somewhat old, and the verification results are not intuitive enough. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. Although the abstract is relatively comprehensive, authors are suggested to start broad in the general background, then narrow in on the relevant topic that will be pursued in the paper. 4. Firstly, the article is repetitive in the introduction and conclusion. Secondly, relevant research background needs to be supplemented in introduction. Therefore, further revisions are necessary to address these issues. 5. Further research is needed in the aspect of theoretical verification. 6. Some of the references in this manuscript are relatively outdated, and it is recommended to reference some of the latest relevant academic research results.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jian Ma
Department, University & Country	School of Civil Engineering, Suzhou University of Science and Technology, China