



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJMCS_3400
Title of the Manuscript:	Are Near Earth Objects the Key to Optimization Theory?

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
My view of what a scientific article should look like, seems different from the one of the author. In my opinion, the article should investigate why different curves look similar, and not simply pose the question; a scientific article should avoid expressions as "it is difficult to imagine that their similarity is accidental" or "...coincidence, which seems highly unlikely", whereas it should prove that they are not. A reviewer has instead the right to express his impressions and opinions, even not demonstrated; if I had "to explain exactly why CFO's Davg curve behaves the way it does" I would write an article, not a review. I stand with my opinion of the similarity being accidental; first, plateaus in deltaV curves are not flat (the logarithmic scale used in Milani's figure may be deceptive) but there is a (well documented) constant increasing trend in DeltaV as deflection is postponed, and this fact has no similarity with trapping; second, many chaotic system exhibit similar trends, with oscillations and plateaus: graphs describing temperature trends (steps corresponds, e.g., to volcanic eruptions) EEG, stock exchange indexes; a rapid search on google images provides plenty of examples; finally, DeltaV oscillations are perfectly explained by the influence of the asteroid eccentricity and steps by close flybys that modify the geometry of the following encounter, and the article does not (but should) highlight if this concepts occur in CFO. My suggestion about CFO improvements did not want to diminish the algorithm merits, but stimulate the author to investigate, for instance, periodicities in the particle behavior, effect of inertia (the CFO examples I found put the inertial term to zero). In my opinion a useful scientific article should investigate such very interesting questions. It is true that sometimes posing a question may be more important than finding the answer but this does not seem the case. Decision on publication depends on the editor's point of view about these considerations.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lorenzo CASALINO
Department, University & Country	DIMEAS - Politecnico di Torino , Italy