

Peer Review

Review of: "From Coherence to Control: A Non-Systematic Approach to Multi-Parametric Phenomena"

Andrea Tomassi¹

1. UniNettuno University, Rome, Italy

Dear Dr. Sandu,

Thank you for your thoughtful reply and for the care you took in addressing my comments. Even from your point-by-point responses, it is evident that you approached the review process with seriousness and with a clear sense of intellectual responsibility. I appreciate the time you invested, and I also appreciate the respectful tone with which you engaged my observations. I should clarify that, at this stage, I have read your response document rather than the fully revised manuscript. With that said, your explanations convey a coherent scientific and philosophical rationale for the revisions you report, and they indicate that you did not treat the requested changes as purely editorial compliance. Your replies show an effort to preserve the conceptual identity of the work while improving its accessibility, traceability, and alignment with academic expectations. This is often the most difficult part of revision because it requires an author to strengthen clarity without flattening the underlying argument. I also want to note that I found the intellectual project you describe genuinely interesting. The way you frame non-equilibrium conditions as a generative domain for coherence, and the way you connect this to the role of the observer, raises questions that are not only methodological but also epistemological. It encourages reflection on what counts as evidence, how salience is established in complex experimental contexts, and how scientific practice can remain rigorous when the phenomena under study resist classical forms of isolation and predictability. Even through the lens of an author response, I found myself thinking about these issues in ways that felt productive and, for me, genuinely new. I am grateful that you took seriously the request to clarify potentially ambiguous conceptual moves, especially where language can slide between physical descriptors and interpretative claims. Your stated effort to specify what is meant by meaning in relation to fluctuations, and to connect claims about geometry, coherence, and observables to operational

language, suggests a commitment to conceptual discipline. This matters because commentary pieces can be most influential when they invite broad thinking while still making clear what is being asserted and what would count as a defensible interpretation of the text. I also appreciated your attention to the practical elements that support scholarly communication, such as the inclusion of keywords and an institutional contact address, and your willingness to reduce repetition in the declarations. These changes may look minor, yet they affect discoverability, accountability, and the long-term usability of a publication.

Let me add a brief note about my own intent as a reviewer. I tried to formulate my comments in a constructive spirit because building is harder than dismantling. It is easy to point out weaknesses; it is more demanding to propose amendments that strengthen a manuscript while respecting the author's aims. Your response indicates that you received the comments in that spirit and worked to integrate them without losing the distinctive orientation of your work.

Thank you again for the care you devoted to this exchange. I look forward to seeing the revised version!

With kind regards

Andrea Tomassi

Uninettuno International Telematic University, Rome, Italy

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.