

The manuscript by Sakahira and Tsumura is interesting and provides insights into the social networks of Jomon period archaeological sites. If the content and findings of the manuscript had not already been published, I would recommend publishing it in the 2022/2023 CAA Conference proceedings volume.

My major concern with the manuscript is the similarity between it and their previous publication:

Sakahira F, Tsumura H (2023) Tipping Points of Ancient Japanese Jomon Trade Networks from Social 357 Network Analyses of Obsidian Artifacts. *Frontiers in Physics*, **10**, 1015870. 358  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2022.1015870>

The first reference to that previous article in the manuscript is on line 230 when the authors state “For details of the number of clusters and single sites for each period, as well as the total number and composition ratios of obsidian artifacts by provenance, please refer to Sakahira and Tsumura (2023).”

They reference that article a second time in the manuscript on line 254 when they say “These results suggest that the obsidian trading network developed throughout the southern Kanto region during the Middle Jomon period and ceased to function during the later period. For more details of these analyses, please refer to Sakahira and Tsumura (2023).”

A comparison of the current manuscript and that previous article shows a very high degree of similarity in structure and wording. I suspect that if the two were run through Turnitin or some other software the two would have a very high similarity metric. If the manuscript were a student paper it would certainly be flagged as possible plagiarism of a previously published article. As far as I can tell the only original contribution of the current manuscript is the section on the bootstrap simulation. That is 9 lines of the manuscript.

I will leave it to the editors to decide whether this level of repetition with a previously published article is too much and prevents the publication of the manuscript in the conference proceedings (for me, it seems like it is), but at the very least the authors should be much more explicit about the similarities between this manuscript and their previously published work, and the novel contribution of this manuscript.