It was interesting to see what angle you took on your article since our projects were so similar. The fact that you (actually) studied biology really shines through. On the one hand, it grounds your article in a really tangible and satisfying way. You’re able to explain the rationale behind every edge of your network, for instance. On the other hand, the emphasis on biological information seems to overshadow all the information theory stuff going on, which as I understand things, is what’s really novel about your project.

TE, AI, and control kernels are not given any background or explanation. I will admit to not reading contemporary physics journals (or even straight biology journals), so I don’t really know current etiquette, but I think most readers would be alienated by the “Results” and “Discussion/Summary” section of your article.

I was also interested in what you framed as the motivation for your project. It was a sort of analyzing-information-dynamics-to-understand-cancer kind of angle. I think you pulled it off, and it all hung together pretty well. Your focus definitely justifies the time you spend explaining the difference between fixed point attractors and cycling attractors. I don’t think you should pull back on any of that information. I do think you should include more big picture forecasting in your introduction, though. You talk about making network models in the last paragraph of the intro. I think you should add a few sentences that let us know you are going to use a network model to measure informational dynamics. Even better you could forecast that you are about to compare the informational dynamics of two similar systems (Wild type and RB knock out).

I used Word’s “track changes” option to make small edits to your article which are, of course, just suggestions. I edit a lot of papers for my TA position, so now I instinctively change things as I read.

Interesting to see how your project turned out,

Kelle