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Is the manuscript scientifically sound in its present form?
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Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?
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Is the language acceptable?
Yes

Is it clear how to access all supporting data?
Yes

Do you have any ethical concerns with this paper?
No

Have you any concerns about statistical analyses in this paper?
No
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Accept as is
Comments to the Author(s)
The authors should compare their results with those presented in the papers

They are welcome to contact the reviewer and/or the first author of them for a sound scientific discussion
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Is the manuscript scientifically sound in its present form?
Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?
Yes

Is the language acceptable?
Yes

Is it clear how to access all supporting data?
Yes

Do you have any ethical concerns with this paper?
No

Have you any concerns about statistical analyses in this paper?
No

Recommendation?
Accept as is

Comments to the Author(s)
The manuscript has been slightly improved in comparison to that one originally submitted to RSPA. The comments I gave then are still valid. This is an interesting, well-written, and scientifically sound paper, but of moderate novelty. As such it certainly qualifies for publication in RSOS, and should be accepted as is.

Klaus Hackl, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
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16-Jun-2015

Dear Mr Biswas

On behalf of the Editor, I am pleased to inform you that your Manuscript RSOS-150188 entitled "A two-state hysteresis model from high dimensional friction" has been accepted for publication in Royal Society Open Science subject to minor revision in accordance with the referee suggestions. Please find the referees' comments at the end of this email.

The reviewers and Subject Editor have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the comments and revise your manuscript.

- Ethics statement
  If your study uses humans or animals please include details of the ethical approval received, including the name of the committee that granted approval. For human studies please also detail whether informed consent was obtained. For field studies on animals please include details of all permissions, licences and/or approvals granted to carry out the fieldwork.

- Data accessibility
  It is a condition of publication that all supporting data are made available either as supplementary information or preferably in a suitable permanent repository. The data accessibility section should state where the article's supporting data can be accessed. This section should also include details, where possible of where to access other relevant research materials such as statistical tools, protocols, software etc can be accessed. If the data has been deposited in an external repository this section should list the database, accession number and link to the DOI for all data from the article that has been made publicly available. Data sets that have been deposited in an external repository and have a DOI should also be appropriately cited in the manuscript and included in the reference list.

- Competing interests
  Please declare any financial or non-financial competing interests, or state that you have no competing interests.

- Authors' contributions
  All submissions, other than those with a single author, must include an Authors’ Contributions section which individually lists the specific contribution of each author. The list of Authors should meet all of the following criteria; 1) substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) final approval of the version to be published.

  All contributors who do not meet all of these criteria should be included in the acknowledgements.

  We suggest the following format:
  AB carried out the molecular lab work, participated in data analysis, carried out sequence alignments, participated in the design of the study and drafted the manuscript; CD carried out the statistical analyses; EF collected field data; GH conceived of the study, designed the study, coordinated the study and helped draft the manuscript. All authors gave final approval for publication.

- Acknowledgements
  Please acknowledge anyone who contributed to the study but did not meet the authorship criteria.
Funding statement
Please list the source of funding for each author.

Because the schedule for publication is very tight, it is a condition of publication that you submit the revised version of your manuscript within 7 days (i.e. by the 25-Jun-2015). If you do not think you will be able to meet this date please let me know immediately.

To revise your manuscript, log into https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rsos and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions". Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript and upload a new version through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the referees and upload a file "Response to Referees" in "Section 6 - File Upload". You can use this to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the referees.

When uploading your revised files please make sure that you have:

1) A text file of the manuscript (tex, txt, rtf, docx or doc), references, tables (including captions) and figure captions. Do not upload a PDF as your "Main Document".
2) A separate electronic file of each figure (EPS or print-quality PDF preferred (either format should be produced directly from original creation package), or original software format)
3) Included a 100 word media summary of your paper when requested at submission. Please ensure you have entered correct contact details (email, institution and telephone) in your user account
4) Included the raw data to support the claims made in your paper. You can either include your data as electronic supplementary material or upload to a repository and include the relevant doi within your manuscript
5) Included your supplementary files in a format you are happy with (no line numbers, vancouver referencing, track changes removed etc) as these files will NOT be edited in production

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Royal Society Open Science and I look forward to receiving your revision. If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Best wishes

Emilie Aime
Senior Publishing Editor
openscience@royalsociety.org
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Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author(s)
The authors should compare their results with those presented in the papers

They are welcome to contact the reviewer and/or the first author of them for a sound scientific discussion

We now have added a new section 6 titled 'Closing note' where we have briefly discussed their work vis a
vis ours, and pointed out possibilities of both approaches benefiting from each other. Further exploration
of these possibilities is left to future work, and we anticipate that we will get in touch with those authors
soon.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author(s)
The manuscript has been slightly improved in comparison to that one originally submitted to RSPA. The
comments I gave then are still valid. This is an interesting, well-written, and scientifically sound paper,
but of moderate novelty. As such it certainly qualifies for publication in RSOS, and should be accepted as
is.

We thank Reviewer 2 for his comments.