

Review of: "Computational substantial violation of the CHSH with close approximation of the respective quantum values"

Mostafa Khater¹

¹ Xuzhou Medical College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper is suitable for this journal after completing the next major revision:

1. The Abstract should contain answers to the following questions: What problem was studied, and why is it important? What methods were used? What are the significant results? What conclusions can be drawn from the results? What is the novelty of the work, and where does it go beyond previous efforts in the literature?
2. The originality of the paper needs to be stated clearly. It is importance to have good results to justify the novelty of a high-quality journal paper. The Introduction should make a compelling case for why the study is helpful and clearly state its novelty or originality by providing relevant information and answering basic questions such as: What is already known in the open literature? What is missing (i.e., research gaps)? What needs to be done, why, and how? Clear statements of the novelty of the work should also appear briefly in the Abstract and Conclusions sections.
3. An updated and complete literature review should be conducted. They should appear as part of the Introduction while considering the work's relevance to this Journal and considering the journal's scope and readership. The results and findings should be compared to and discussed in the context of earlier work in the literature.
4. This paper should be edited grammatically.
5. They should double-check the mathematical formulations and add appropriate references for governing equations.
6. At the end of all equations, "COMMA" or "POINT" must follow the typing rules. Therefore, they need to pre-check all the papers.
7. What is the robustness of the proposed method?
8. What is the effectiveness of the proposed method over the existing process? The comparison should be made with the
9. I recommend a revision of the introduction. In my opinion, you should explain your results in more detail in the introduction
10. Compare them with those available in the literature, including discussions on potential applications.
11. English of the whole paper should be checked for grammar.
12. Check the journal format and make all the references according to the journal style.
13. Authors should add some relevant papers in reference for a better manuscript presentation.
14. The reviewed literature about this work was not complete; the following actions, all papers, should be cited in the revised manuscript: 10.1142/S0217979223500832; 10.1016/j.chaos.2023.113232; 10.1016/j.rinp.2023.106312;

10.1142/S0217979223500716; 10.1142/S0217979223500686; 10.1142/S0217979223500522;

10.1016/j.rinp.2023.106227; 10.1016/j.chaos.2022.113098; 10.1016/j.rinp.2022.106193; 10.1016/j.rinp.2022.106045

Finally, the manuscript needs a significant revision.