Review of: "Further comments on ‘Is the moon there if nobody looks? Bell inequalities and physical reality’"

Juan Pablo Jorge[1]

1 University of Buenos Aires

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In my opinion, the article is not clear enough for a reader who is not a specialist on the subject. It presupposes a reader who is fully involved in the discussion raised. For a non-specialist reader on the subject, it is strictly necessary to constantly refer to the references to follow the argument presented by Richard Gill. The article would benefit greatly from a few more pages in the introduction, in which the general framework of the discussion is presented in more detail.

Models (1) and (3) should be better introduced in the preliminaries of the article so that it is a little more self-contained. If it were this way, the differences marked by Gill and some of his statements would be much clearer, such as: I suspect that MK allows for statistically dependent settings because in the models of many of his earlier papers, and in particular, in his model (1), he employs the detection loophole …

All the respective criticism of the use of notation by M. Kupczynski, together with his successive changes, should be made minimally explicit in order to give more importance to the final part and conclusions by R. Gill.

Since quantum contextuality is absolutely related to what is discussed in this article, it seems to me that you could also benefit from making some links to the following article, which has an excellent treatment of contextuality in a mathematical framework given by negative probabilities: Measure-theoretic approach to negative probabilities, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367635287_Measure-theoretic_approach_to_negative_probabilities DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.34776.57601

Observation: it seems to me that it would be convenient to refer to the author with whom one is discussing using "M. Kupczynski" and not just MK.