

Review of: "Consistent Interpretation of Quantum and Classical Mechanics"

Towfic Shomar¹

¹ University of Jordan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is obvious that the writer is not familiar with the deep and important discussions related to the foundational questions of QM and is depending on a popular 101 physics course to discuss issues that troubled theoretical physics for over a century.

- There are many more than the three hypothetical positions that the writer posit: realistic (i.e. Einstein et al), Copenhagen (Bohr et al in the writer's view) and the agnostic position in regard to wave particle duality. There are many interpretations of QM and many theories that can account for the experimental facts of QM with many ontological and epistemological understanding, to mention but some: GRW, Bohm hidden variables, Many worlds interpretation, decoherences, Bohr's, De-Broglie, And many more interpretations and discussions related to such issues, Cashing, Brown, Biller and Fine, Faye, Pais, Born, Jammer, etc.
- The writer ought to be moderate in his/her claims such as "including the **proper and correct** physics and mathematics needed to take a firm stand on only one of the positions listed above"!!!!??? Has the author ever heard of the argument from history? "History of science reveal to us that even our best theories, those that got experimental and theoretical supported, turned out to be wrong" (see Larry Laudan and Thomas Kuhn).
- The writer presents a very shallow definition of "complete" related to combining classical and quantum mechanical concepts, but does not define the meaning of "Complete", even within his list of references there are two articles on the meaning of complete theory (EPR and Bohr 1935) which can give the writer a clue on how to define complete: what is the meaning of complete? How can we define something as complete? Is it essential for physics?
- The writer obviously do not know the work done by De-Broglie and Poincare, and hence he never saw or read anything on Poincare Sphere, otherwise he/she would not present his/her claims in page 4.
- The writer ought to read Born more carefully and understand the meaning of statistical interpretation of QM.
- The writer ought to read David Bohm's works.
- The writer might find many references that might help him/her in Shomar's 2008, 2013, 2020, Faye 1991, Folse 1985, Fine 1986, Beller and Fine 1993, Brown 1994, Jammer 1966, Pais 1991, and many other references concerning the issues he/she is raising.

The paper needs major changes to even be considered for reviewing not alone being published.

