



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	

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, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	I'm not expert in English but I think the writing can be improved as well as the clarity of presentation. - Some figures and tables seem to be far from the place they are referenced. - Most of the references are too old; the newest is already three years old. - It is not clear to me what the benefits of their approach are. It seems that there is a lack of a state of the art study and the necessary comparison to other approaches. [comment received as email from reviewer]	I'm not expert in English but I think the writing can be improved as well as the clarity of presentation. - Some figures and tables seem to be far from the place they are referenced. →The authors agree with the reviewer's suggestions and suggested changes would be made. - Most of the references are too old; the newest is already three years old. →As the presented work is an implementation work, the authors were careful to perform multiple spectrum of quantitative and qualitative testing of the prototypes extensively before publishing as the acceptable journal work. Further, there exist latest applications and publications of the suggested implementation and they would be referenced in the corrected paper. - It is not clear to me what the benefits of their approach are. It seems that there is a lack of a state of the art study and the necessary comparison to other approaches. →Unfortunately, there does not exist any work in the literature in context of Evolvable Hardware research domain that focuses on the challenge of maintaining "behavioral congruence" between the simulated (virtual)



SDI Review Form 1.6

		configurable substrate and its physical (real-world) implementation qualitatively and quantitatively. The lack of this mentioned “congruence” in EH field is detrimental to apply the evolved solutions in simulation to the real-world problems without substantial inaccuracies (w.r.t simulated version), thus the current paper is an effort to build a physical implementation of a highly promising reconfigurable substrate ,CTRNNs, that can be faithful to its simulated counterpart and satisfy the much needed “ behavioral congruence ” in the current EH domain.
Minor REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		