



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_14574
Title of the Manuscript:	Control gain and cost of pinning control for BA scale-free networks
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 (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	I have carefully read the manuscript. Overall, the paper is not well written because there are so many grammar errors and bad structured sentences throughout the paper. In particular, the pinning controller and the pinning strategy in this paper have been extensively and intensively studied in many existing papers such as Refs 5 and 6. Moreover, the authors are strongly advised to cite most recent work closely related to the topic of this paper. Figs. 1 and 2 show the variation of $\min \lambda(-A+D)$ with respect to the control gains for pinning the biggest and smallest nodes, respectively. I wonder if the authors have considered the effect of the number of pinned nodes. The only novelty of the paper is that the authors define the cost function Eq. 7 in terms of the coupling strength, the number of pinned nodes and pinning feedback gains. Although I am not satisfied with this paper, I advise that the authors might be given a chance to significantly improve the English writing and the quality of the paper in their revised manuscript. The authors are also encouraged to study the pinning control of complex networks with directed network topologies.	We thank the referee for his/her time and effort in reviewing our manuscript. The referee raised pertinent comments and suggestions on our English writing, citing recent results on pinning control and the study of directed networks. Detailed modifications are as follows: Answer: We rewrite some sentences in our paper to make it more graceful which is highlighted in main text with yellow colour. In the main text, there is an interesting result that we should control nodes with smallest degree based on our new control cost function in full agreement with Ref. [18] and our control cost function is more valuable than that in Ref. [18]. In section 4 of the main text, we investigate the controller numbers when pinning nodes with smallest degree. And we get a conclusion that we should not pin all of the nodes with smallest degree. Furthermore, we cite the recent paper about pinning control [13-17], [19, 20]. In the next step, we shall investigate the pinning control strategy and control cost for directed networks. We thank the referee for his/her valuable comments and suggestions, which greatly help us improving our manuscript to meet the high standard of PSIJ. We hope the revised paper can be recommended for publication as it is.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		