



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>)

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>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Minvydas Ragulskis
Department, University & Country	Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania