

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

[Paper removed, will be broken down to two different projects] Big Data, Granger Causality Analysis, and the Undecidability Property of Neuroimaging

Patrick Bloniasz¹

¹ Boston University

Funding: The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Abstract

The original paper is being reworked into two different projects: one computational and one philosophical. You can see the early version of the paper in v1 here on Qeios. However, future versions of the paper will be unrelated to this version. Version 1 was merely a pulse check for the overall concept for the work before substantial time was put into the paper. Please see my notes to all reviewers below. If you are a new reviewer, you do not need to provide additional feedback.

NOTE TO REVIEWERS:

I appreciate the time and consideration each reviewer took to provide feedback on this early manuscript. I wanted to reply in bulk to the feedback. **If you are a new reviewer coming to comment on this paper, you need not take the time to leave a reply since the original manuscript is being broken into two different papers.**

One comment I have seen a few times on this work is that it is lacking experimental results. For this first version of the paper, this was intentional, as the paper was primarily *philosophical* in nature. I have been drawing readers mostly from the natural sciences for this specific paper, and as such I will split this work into two pieces: 1) a philosophical critique that will be presented at a conference this October (2022), and 2) a purely quantitative, simulation-based analysis of GGC looking at spurious connectivity and how to improve it.

Second, there were frequent comments regarding the lack of novelty to the paper in practice. The main motivation for the philosophical critique was that misinterpretations are still found in the literature quite frequently and so, while the problem is not new, it was worth making explicit. However, as requested, the paper will be broke into two papers, where the computational paper provides actionable code to demonstrate the issue and will provide practical steps to fix the issue.

Third, there were comments regarding the paper being incomplete or overly informal. These are accurate comments, because the paper itself was designed as such to get feedback on the general ideas themselves.

Thank you for taking interest in my work!