



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7691
Title of the Manuscript:	An ASIC Analog Neuromorphic Computer for Evolvable Hardware Applications
Type of the Article	Computer Engineering

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	Linguistic corrections 1) In abstract, the statement "ASIC hardware forms of neural networks programed into the chip" should be corrected as "ASIC hardware forms of neural networks are programed into the chip". 2) At the final paragraph of Introduction, the statement "..., although it is assumed that there others ." should be corrected as "... , although it is assumed that there are others." . 3) After equation (1), "... from the jth to ith the neuron, ..." should be changed to "... from the jth to the ith neuron, ...". Also, "... input with strength s_i The set of parameters corresponding to a neuron, the synaptic weights (w), the time constant (τ) and the bias (θ) is called as an individual neuron configuration ..." should be written as follows "... input with strength s_i . The set of parameters corresponding to a neuron, including the synaptic weights (w), the time constant (τ) and the bias (θ), is called as an individual neuron configuration ..." . 4) In section V. conclusions and discussion, the statement "The major advantage of choosing CTRNNs is that one can easily transition between ..." should be corrected as "The major advantage of choosing CTRNNs is that one can easily make the transition between ..." .	The authors agree with the reviewer's suggestions and suggested changes would be made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- During referring to the references of the literature-- references [3], [4], [21] and [22] should appear sequentially. 2- Conventionally, in formal papers, the description of figures should appear in the literature before their appearance and not after. The same problem can be addressed for the appearance of TABLE I. 3- Also in an inception of a statement, it is written “ Tables 1 and 2 ...”. This should be changed to “Tables I and II ...”.	The authors agree with the reviewer’s suggestions and suggested changes would be made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although, an old conclusion (in <i>Ref.</i> [1]) is addressed here; concerning that CTRNNs can be considered as safe tools for use in configured control devices, the main distinction between this paper and Reference [1] is the use of current instead of voltage to analyse and represent neuron activations. Paragraphs describing most equations are in a copy-paste style from other references. Nevertheless, the average plagiarism score is less than 10%.	The reviewer is right in perceiving that current implementation corroborate with the existing conclusion, with current control, but the latest implementation as lesser operational resource requirements in terms of real estate (small size) and power requirements. The percentage of the plagiarism might not apply to the sequential work of the same author or same research facility. The reference papers are the previously reviewed work of the same author. But, authors truly appreciate the reviewer’s intentions to enforce highest quality of the paper and journal in the context of the plagiarism