

## A Post-Quantum Associative Memory

<b>Referee Affiliation</b>	Slovak Academy of Sciences, Mathematical institute
<b>Manuscript ID:</b>	JPhysA-118974.R1
<b>Manuscript Type</b>	Paper
<b>Article Keywords</b>	associative memory, generalized probabilistic theory, quantum theory
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	14-Jun-2023
<b>Date Review Returned:</b>	28-Jun-2023
<b>M-Score for this man...</b>	24.00

**GUIDE TO REVIEWER**

Papers published in [Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical](#) should contain novel results that substantially advance their relevant field. Articles that repeat or add only incrementally to already published work will not be acceptable.

**QUALITY RATING**

Please rate the manuscript for the originality, significance and clarity of the content. Guidance is available [here](#)

	<b>Very Low</b> Not publishable	<b>Low</b> Publishable only in an archival journal	<b>Medium</b> Would require major improvement to be publishable in this journal	<b>High</b> Likely to be publishable in this journal	<b>Very High</b> (Top 10%) Definitely publishable in this journal
<b>req</b> Originality				✓	
<b>req</b> Significance				✓	
<b>req</b> Clarity				✓	

---

## QUESTIONS

Please answer these questions, which are for the benefit of the Editors (the answers will not normally be transmitted to the authors). If you have any explanatory comments, please add them to the "Comments to the Editor(s)" box below.

**req Please rate the scientific rigour**

High

**Has the author adequately taken into account all the points made in the previous report(s)?**

Yes

**req Web of Science Peer Review Transparency**

This journal now offers the option of [Transparent Peer Review](#). If you (and the other reviewer(s) and authors) agree then the reviewer reports will be linked from the published article, should the article be accepted. If you choose to decline, the reviewer reports will not be published.

Agree

**req Reviewer Anonymity**

If you have agreed above for your review reports to be published, please indicate whether you would like your name to publicly appear with your report on Web of Science by indicating Yes or No. If you have declined to participate, please also select No to this question.

No, I would not like my name to appear

Thank you for reviewing this article for Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical.

This article should be treated as CONFIDENTIAL and the information contained therein should not be cited until the article is published. The report should not be communicated directly to the author.

## Recommendation

Accept

## COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR(S)

## COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S)

In the revised version, the authors added a new result, showing that the minimal dimension of the GPT that can contain large sets of mutually  $N$ -distinguishable elements has the same scaling for any  $N$  and therefore exponentially outperforms classical or quantum theory. This significantly extends the previous version, where this was proved for  $N=2$ . The proof idea is based on nonconstructive probabilistic method and is quite ingenious. Although a construction of an explicit GPT of such minimal dimension is not provided and may be quite hard, this new result completes the paper in a satisfactory manner.

A few minor comments and typos:

1. statement of Th. 13: "is hosting  $m$  pairwise..." should be  $2^m$
2. p. 8, line 1 in Sec. 3.1: I am not sure that "disclaimer" is the proper word here...
3. Theorem 15: in the paper [16] it is also proved that the vertices of a hypercube are the only set of points with the given property
4. There is some confusion in Definition 22. First,  $Q$  is assumed to be subgraph of a hypergraph, that means itself a hypergraph, which is a pair consisting of a set of nodes and a collection of hyperedges. So writing a  $\in Q$ , one should specify if it is a node or a hyperedge, to be precise. And then, what exactly is  $Q'$ ? A subgraph (what are the edges?) or a subset of nodes? A subset of nodes would make more sense, but then

one should write  $q_I \subseteq Q$ . Also, the quantifiers in the last sentence of Def. 22 seem in wrong order, it looks like all the  $q_I$ 's should be the same. Would it not be easier just to write that all  $q_I \in \Theta$ ? Or that the subgraph generated by  $Q$  is complete? This should be better formulated.  
(By the way, what is the role of the indices  $j$  and  $l$  in  $\theta^j$  and  $q_I$ ? They do not seem necessary)

Files attached

Do you want to get recognition for this review on <https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-workflow-solutions/researcher-profiles/> Web of Science?

No

---

#### Author's Response

Files attached