



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_27863
Title of the Manuscript:	Hybrid chaotic systems
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper discusses the piecewise defined differential dynamical systems. The analysis is done by using the symbolic dynamics and the transition matrices. The forced damped piecewise oscillator, which is modelled by the second-order non-autonomous differential equation, is further discussed. With different set of parameter values, the solutions obtained show the chaotic behaviour. The result of the paper is well-reported. However, the presentation of the paper could be further improved. Some comments are given as follow: 1. Use ordinary differential equation (ODE) when it is the first time appeared in the text, then ODE could be used in advanced. 2. The symbols, which is used in Eq. (1.1), shall be defined after the equation is written. Do not define in Section 2. 3. The bracket] [in the line after Eq. (2.2) shall be double checked. If the bracket] [is correct, then it ought to define. 4. The calculation of the topological entropy is not described clearly. For convenience, the comments are given on the parts which are highlighted in the yellow colour.	Some answers and comments to the Reviewer are given below in order: 1. It was modified according to the referee's suggestion. 2. It was modified according to the referee's suggestion. 3. The brackets were changed. 4. We make some modifications in order to clarify the calculation of the topological entropy All of the comments highlighted in the yellow colour by the Reviewer were modified according to the suggestions made, except the ones presented in Minor REVISION comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The numbering of the citation in the text is suggested to use [] rather than [()]. This is to avoid the confusion since () is used for the numbering of equation.	1. We agree with this comment but we were unable to solve the problem about the wrong appearance of the numbering of the citation in the text by



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. The numbering of the equation shall be labelled accordingly from (1), (2), ..., and so on. The labels of (1.1), (2.1), and (3.1) are usually used in the thesis or report.	impossibility in template handling. 2. It's the template of the journal that makes these type of labels.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Are any citations refer in Section 3? Especially, the function of the address of the points and Proposition 3.1. 2. The title of the paper is too general.	1. More citations about the subject were introduced in this section. 2. The title of the paper was changed.