

## Special Query to Author

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript number 2013/BJMCS/3381 (Title: **Pseudorandomness in Central Force Optimization**). Our Initial Review and Screening Subcommittee (IRSS) found a similar publication:

Available at (<http://sci2s.ugr.es/eamhco/pdfs/formato10arXiv.pdf>,

<http://arxiv.org/abs/1001.0317>)

As per our strict quality control policy we cannot consider any published paper for our journals (Our General editorial Policy states: Submission of a manuscript clearly indicates that: the study has not been published (partly or as a whole) before or is not under consideration for publication elsewhere (except as an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis)) (Link: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy> ).

Therefore, you are kindly requested to clarify this case at the earliest. Kindly inform us, if you have made any mistake during manuscript submission or not. If you have published this paper as only abstract in any conference, you need to adequately restructure the paper before submitting here to avoid any possible copyright or legal conflict.

If these papers (attached) are not same and there is no question of plagiarism. you need to certify the same in writing. After your certification other peer review formalities will be started

# Author Reply for Special Query

I am happy to provide additional information as requested. The arXiv website at Cornell University Library <http://arxiv.org/> is a repository of materials that are posted by their authors as "preprints," but which at the time of posting have not been "published" in the peer-reviewed literature. I suspect that most of the articles available at arXiv are subsequently published in peer-reviewed journals, and I know that it is common practice in the community to post first at arXiv and then make a formal submission to a reviewed journal.

That applies in this case. I submitted two papers to BJMCS, "Pseudorandomness in Central Force Optimization," which I posted at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1001.0317>, and "Are Near Earth Objects the Key to Optimization Theory?," which also is posted at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.1394>. Both of these are my original work not previously published in any peer-reviewed journal, and not under consideration for publication elsewhere. These papers are freely downloadable from the arXiv website, but they should not have been posted on any other website (at most a link might be provided).

I understand why BJMCS may be concerned about this situation because the arXiv posting might be considered prior "publication." But, to my knowledge and experience (I have had other papers posted at arXiv subsequently submitted to and published in peer-reviewed journals, and never before has this question come up), it is standard practice in the community to post at arXiv for reasons of timeliness and then to formally submit to a journal such as BJMCS for review and publication there. I believe if you spend some time on the arXiv site and then search for later published papers you will find a plethora of examples. I have reproduced a couple below.

In the first one, the arXiv posting already had been presented at the AIAA/AAS conference on Flight Dynamics, Santa Barbara, CA Feb 2001, paper# AAS 01-236, and presumably published in the conference's proceedings, and it was subsequently submitted to the "Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics" for peer review and publication if accepted. The second example is similar in that the work already was accepted as a conference paper.

My submissions to BJMCS were made precisely in this manner, and, as I said, to my knowledge, this commonly is done as these examples clearly show.

Nonetheless, if BJMCS cannot accept manuscripts that have been posted on arXiv, please withdraw the two pending papers and let me know that you have done so.

I very much appreciate the Journal staff's time and consideration in reviewing my submissions, and if it happens that they must be withdrawn, please accept my apology for the inconvenience. I assure you that these submissions were made entirely in good faith following what I believe unquestionably is a standard practice in the community.