



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 BJMCS 2725
Title of the Manuscript:	Piece-wise Information for the Truncated Cosinor Model

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

The paper studies the average-per-observation matrix for the truncated cosinor model. The authors derived a new method to divide the total information and uncertainty into three parts for the truncated cosinor model. It states an orthogonal decomposition of this matrix such that the total information can be obtained as a sum of three particular parts.

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In which biological models can be applied the method presented in the paper?	In blood pressure measurements, there is a problem concerning the time that these measurements should be taken. The "non-social hours", i.e. night hours, provide food for thought for the truncated space.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Pay attention to English language: -page 2, reformulate lines 1-2 and line 7. - page 5, line under (3.3): the sentence "It is easy to see ..." is not correct grammatically. - page 6, line 8 from below: you missed a dot. - page 6, line 6 from below: "influences". -page 9, line 3 from below: add "is" before "evaluated as". - page 11, under (3.35): add "is" before "obtained". - page 12, line 2 above conclusions: please reformulate the sentence "Therefore, the minimum of ...".	We have revised the language (according to referee's suggestions). In the pdf file we have marked with yellow the changes or new lines that inserted in the context. Moreover, we have deleted: pg. 1 (1 st parag.): "in terms... of information". pg. 2 (bottom): "and the estimates... Kitsos et al.". pg. 3 (2 nd parag.): "Moreover any equality... can be produced". pg. 4: eq. (2,15). pg. 7: eq. (3.11) and the above removed and added as Appendix. pg. 8: unnumbered eq. after "Applying the above to..." shorten and the detailed part of it moved to Appendix. pg. 9: eq. (3.20) shorten and the detailed part of it moved to Appendix. pg. 11: eq. (3.38) shorten and the detailed part of it moved to Appendix.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		pg. 12: eq. (3.40) and (3.41) shorten and the detailed part of them moved to Appendix. An Appendix section was added as well as the Acknowledgements. Finally two new references was also added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The reviewer does not agree with the assertion at page 1 (line 8 from below): “the total sum of these parts will provide the total information ...”. This is a mechanistic point of view and it does not correspond to reality. There are lot of other aspect that should be considered in order to explain the biologic and physical phenomena. Though, since mathematically it is difficult to consider all these aspects and their interconnection, we are content with this simple study.	We deleted the specific phrase. There some grounds that make us to agree with the referee.