The author's comments to the editor objections

to the paper "The informational physical model: some fundamental problems in physics", submission EPJP-D-21-03069, which are in the editor's E-mail September 6, 2021; and are the base for the editor's decision for the submission rejection EPJP-D-21-03069 - [EMID:32e4d7eec7b4b66c]

Further "italic" relates to editor's text:

"…---*Start of the* [paper] *quotation*---

[the paper's sect.] 2.4.3 "Why does the QM postulate exist that all given type particles are identical, and why is it adequate to the reality"

- this QM postulate is adequate to the reality because all such particles are copies of the same informational pattern, that is a typical situation in Information.

---*End of the [paper] quotation*---

[editor's objection] *The way the question posed as the title to the section is addressed is not satisfactory in any possible scientific sense. Indeed, never in the paper it is explained in which sense all particles of a given type are "copies of the same informational pattern", nor it is explained what this informational pattern is*.

- that everything is absolutely for sure nothing else besides **some informational patterns/systems of the patterns** that are elements of the absolutely fundamental and absolutely infinite "Information" Set is rigorously proven in the "The Information as Absolute" concept, and that is written in the paper's sect. 2.1 "What are the phenomena/notions "Matter" and "Consciousness". What is "Information" is written in the sect. 2.2 "What is "Information"

Including every material object, including every particle, is completely for sure some informational pattern/system, whereas any informational pattern/system evidently can have arbitrary number of identical copies; as, say, the informational pattern "this text" can have any number of identical copies.

Correspondingly in this case the QM postulate above, which **is introduced in QM** – as that any other postulates in physics are**,** though, purely ad hoc with only purpose to fit the theory with experiment, and the postulate **has no any explanation in QM – why that is so**? – thus this question, correspondingly is posed the sect 2.4.3. fundamentally scientifically, and obtains completely scientific explanation in the sect 2.4.3.

That above is quite clearly presented in the submitted paper, and so **the editor's conclusion** about sect. 2.4.3

"…. *From how it is written, we should simply accept the answer written without even understanding what this answer actually means, and this is clearly unacceptable*…."

- looks as something that is too strange, and by no means is some scientific objection in this case.

Next objection:

---*Start of the* [paper*] quotation*---

[the paper's sect. 2.4.3 text] That above in this section is essentially the answer on the fundamental problem:

2.4.4 "What is physical parameter "Energy"

- however that answer remains to be "metaphysically" incomplete, Energy remains to be a mysterious element of "Logos" set. Nonetheless…. – etc. (see full quote in the editor's E-mail

---*End of the* [paper] *quotation*---

[editor's objection] *As it is clear from reading the entire content of section 2.4.4, it is never explained in what sense the content of section 2.4.3 is the answer to the problem posed in section 2.4.4.*

- that is again some strange claim, because in the paper **in section 2.4.3 it is quite clearly explained "what is "Energy" in physical sense** – that is something that is necessary to change, including to create, any informational pattern/system, including everything in Matter, because of the fundamental logical self-inconsistence of the [absolutely] fundamental phenomenon "Change".

Thus Energy overcomes this logical prohibition of changes above, however, besides, on some level of changes Energy isn't sufficient, and the states of changing patterns/systems turn out to be uncertain "illogical"– just therefore in Matter the quantum objects/events/processes absolutely inevitably exist; and ad hoc QM correspondingly exists.

All these fundamental points above again have no any explanation in existent physics, i.e. outside the conception and the model; and is scientifically clarified only in the conception and the model – see the submitted paper.

Section 2.4.4 – and that is quite clearly written in the quotation above - **relates to "metaphysical" problems,** and in this case Energy remains to be some utmost mysterious phenomenon in science. However, to understand – what is Energy in Matter in physics - it is enough to know what is written in the sect. 2.4.3.

All that above is quite clearly presented in the submitted paper, and so **the editor's conclusion in** the italic above looks as something that is too strange and by no means is some scientific objection in this case.

Nonetheless the editor writes next objection:

"*A similar attitude is maintained throughout the paper, for instance, right before section 4.3.3 the author writes"*

---*Start of the* [paper] *quotation*---

[the paper's text] Together with the points above, the corresponding fundamental 300 years old physical problem

4.3.3 "Why the fundamentally different inertial and gravitational masses are equivalent at least at statics"

- is solved: both masses are equivalent since both are proportional to the same frequency ω , with which the particles algorithms cyclically run.

---*End of the* [paper] *quotation*---

[editor's this objection's points italic] "*An answer is given without any motivation. Indeed, it is never explained what the "particles algorithm" is, nor it is described in detail…*"

- (!) what is "particle" and what is "particles algorithms" is described in detail in the special sections 3.4 "What is "a particle"": "…particles — which absolutely for sure are informational patterns/systems — are some objects that constantly change their states; however, at that, they are stable, it seems to rationally follow that particles are some cyclic close-loop algorithms …."

"*…. Therefore, it is impossible to understand what the frequency of the algorithm is, and why the two masses are proportional to this frequency….*"

-(!) – that is quite clearly for any professional physicist, again, explained in section 3.4 relating to the inertial mass, and in section 4.3.2 "What is Gravity" relating to gravitational mass; an example for electrons is in section 4.3.5 "Why the Gravity force in a number of tens orders of magnitude weaker than other forces",

and, finally, the editor's conclusion

"…. Essentially, once again, we must accept the answer proposed without a clear indication to why it is actually an answer…"

- this editor's objections/conclusion in italic above again look as too strange, and all that by no means is some scientific objection in this case.

Next objection

"*….. It is true that some references in which it is said that the models are described are pointed out (3, 7, 12), however, these references appear to be not yet peer reviewed (the links given in the paper point to open repositories), and the paper submitted to EPJP simply recall the results of these references without adding anything new so that it is not clear why it should be published in the first place….*"

- that many of references in the submissions "appear to be not yet peer reviewed (the links given in the paper point to open repositories)" is correct, however from that some scientific work is published in an "open repository" by no means follows that this work isn't scientific.

In this case all referenced papers were submitted to some official physical and philosophical journals, and were rejected by editors – as that is till now with this

submission in this journal, in spite of all are undoubtedly publishable – as that is with this submission,

- i.e. all submitted papers **contain quite new and actual results** – new models of fundamental forces, explanations what are the Lorentz transformations and the relativity theories, proposed experiments that could solve fundamental problems of observation of the absolute motion and quantum nature of Gravity, etc.; this submission– see the paper's abstract – is only conclusive review of these papers.

Say, the "Information as Absolute" concept paper was rejected by editors of 10 philosophical journals, whereas in the concept practically all transcendent in the mainstream philosophy fundamental phenomena/notions are scientifically defined, and so many philosophical problems are solved' etc. – whereas in philosophical journals anything is publishable, and is published.

Such situation really is now utmost objective and positive peer review for any scientific work, and in this case for the concept and physical model, including this submission.

Thus it turned out to be that only moderators of "open repositories", first of all viXra, don't have some problems with ethics [and, possibly, problems with professional level of editors, as seems that is in this case], and the papers are published in these repositories.

However, again, that are completely scientific publications, and so really there are no any rational reasons for prohibition corresponding references in official physical journals papers. The requirement to point in the papers only "legitimate" references is absurdity, and, say, 50 years ago and earlier, when physics indeed – unlike the last 50 years, when such limitations were introduced in publications – really developed, in the journals even such references as "private communication", where ethical authors pointed that the written idea has some other authors, were an ordinary thing.

From the above completely clearly and undoubtedly follows, that final editor's conclusions:

1) according to what I wrote above, the paper does not present any new scientific result;
2) since there are no new results, they can not be actual;
3) it is not possible to judge inconsistencies of the paper because no physical model is really analyzed and no physical problem is addressed;
4) since there are no results, it makes no sense to judge about possible consequences of the results themselves;
5) it is not possible to make a comparison with experimental results

- only mean that the editor seem as has insufficient competence in problems that are considered in the submitted paper, and so understood practically nothing in the paper's content.

The paper evidently contains new scientific results – in the paper more 30 real fundamental physical problems are either solved or essentially clarified, is so evidently actual, and is in complete accordance with all really valid experimental data, and so is undoubtedly publishable in any, including EPJP, physical journal.

S. Shevchenko