



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_44453
Title of the Manuscript:	MODULATED FEEDBACK AND COUPLING TIME DELAYS, AND ALL-TO-ALL CHAOS SYNCHRONIZATION IN A NETWORK OF NETWORKS:ONE OF THE SIMPLEST CASES
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>#1. Authors are right – networks of networks is a very hot topic in nonlinear dynamics. But why they study a trivial system – and call it a network of networks? It is a simple and ordinary network with delays between systems.</p> <p>#2. Authors investigate ordinary synchronization. But authors should be aware that many different types of chaos synchronization exist. For example – phase synchronization, amplitude envelope synchronization, delay synchronization, generalized synchronization, etc.. Why they are investigating only one type of synchronization?</p> <p>#3. When talking about chaotic networks, authors should be aware that many different phenomena observed in nonlinear networks (except synchronization). Typical examples are chimera waves, breather waves, etc.. Why authors do not even mention these effects? Could these effects be observable in their model of the network?</p> <p>#4. Authors talk about the comparison between the analytical and numerical results. But analytical results are so trivial that the comparisons are not adequate. Authors must modify such discussions.</p> <p>#5. The first figure (the optical scheme) is not appropriate. If authors do not model optical effects – why they use an optical schematic diagram?</p>	<p>We appreciate very much the Reviewer's comments to improve the presentation of this paper. Our response to these comments is the followings:</p> <p>1.As we underlined in the title of this MS we considered only one of the simplest cases. As emphasized in Section 2, we consider systems y, z and u,w as a simple networks. These networks are in turn are connected via system x. It is very easy to complicate this structure. Imagine that all systems consist of several more subsystems. But as our aim was to consider only simplest case, in this MS we restricted ourselves to the configuration under consideration. As noted in Section "Conclusions" such simplest structure could play the role of building blocks for more complex and complicated networks.</p> <p>2. The honourable Reviewer is completely right. There are many other types of synchronization, but we considered only the case of complete synchronization-simplest case of synchronization. Our aim in this MS was to show that one can achieve synchronization between all the systems. Consideration of other types of synchronization is left for future work. Meanwhile in the revised MS we have taken into account the Reviewer remark and add a paragraph about other possible types of synchronization. Just in the beginning of Section I.</p> <p>3. In the revised MS we have taken into account these comments by adding that there are many other interesting phenomena such as chimera states, breather waves, etc can be found in networks structures. But investigation of these aspects is beyond the scope of this MS. This very short discussion is added just before Section CONCLUSION.</p> <p>4.Numerical simulations are conducted on the basis of analytical approach. And there is excellent agreement between the theory and numerics. We are sure without the theoretical results it could have been impossible to choose such values of parameters causing synchronization. In that context theoretical part in this MS is necessary however trivial it can be seen from the viewpoint of the honourable Reviewer. We dare to disagree with the Reviewer at this point.</p> <p>5. Ikeda model is directly related to optics. As indicated in Section 2 even some laser models can be modelled by this system. For relevant supporting literature see, e.g. Ref. 23-24, 29. Therefore in our humble opinion Figure 1 is very much relevant to this MS.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	