

Paper: “Towards Broadcasting Linear Content Over 5G Network”

Submitted: 19 June 2023

Accepted: 30 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Olimpjon Shurdi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p246](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p246)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ariesto Hadi

Topazart, Indonesia

Reviewer 2: Xi Chen

University of Kentucky, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 29/6/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 7/7/2023
Manuscript Title: TOWARDS BROADCASTING LINEAR CONTENT OVER 5G NETWORK	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There is no method	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The grammar is written well.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is clear, but it is unstructured written as journal article.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Need citation	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> References are not used APA style	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is good, however it needs rewriting:

- Add research method in Abstract
- Rewrite following the structure of journal article (see the template)
- Add citation and future research in Conclusion
- Use APA style for citation and references

Reviewer O:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

While this abstract provides a good general overview of the topic, there are some aspects that could be improved for clarity and coherence. Here are some critiques:

Clarity: The abstract contains several long sentences with multiple clauses, which can make it challenging to follow. Breaking these down into shorter, more direct sentences could enhance readability.

Coherence: The transition between ideas could be smoother. For example, the shift from discussing the evolution of linear content to specific considerations of broadcasting this content over 5G networks seems abrupt. A connecting sentence might be beneficial.

Focus: While the abstract mentions the future of 3GPP 5G MBS standards and non-3GPP networks, it does not provide a clear indication of what the paper's main arguments or conclusions might be. Elaborating a bit more on the central focus of the paper would be useful.

Grammar and Style: There are a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be revised for better flow. For instance, "Broadcast of liner content is evolving," might be better written as "The broadcast of linear content is evolving." Similarly, "it is has changed" should be corrected to "it has changed".

Terminology: Some terms like "hassle cellular networks" are not clear. If this is a technical term, it should be defined, or if it's a typo, it should be corrected.

In essence, while the abstract has a good starting point, it could benefit from better organization, clarity, and a more explicit indication of the paper's primary focus or conclusions.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Upon careful review, your text appears to be well-written and doesn't contain any obvious spelling or grammar errors. You have done a great job of adhering to proper English syntax, and you have used technical terminology appropriately. However, you

may want to consider making the text a bit more concise for better readability, especially when dealing with complex technical subjects.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Given that this is a review paper, it appears that the author has not included any specific methodologies.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

This document is well-written and clear, which indicates the author's expertise in the subject matter. Nonetheless, considering this is a review paper, it is important that it not only provides comprehensive coverage of the subject but also analyses and synthesizes the information presented.

The author appropriately starts by introducing the development of the 5G Multicast Broadcast (MBB) services field and its basic concepts, which provides a solid foundation for readers unfamiliar with the topic. This initial explanation is valuable as it sets the stage for the discussion to follow.

However, as the paper progresses, the author presents various examples and facts about the implementation and implications of 5G MBB services. While this is crucial to demonstrate the breadth and depth of the topic, it falls short in that there isn't an immediate synthesis or interpretation of the presented information.

In other words, the author lists instances and data, but does not consistently draw conclusions or extract key points from these. For instance, it would be beneficial to understand the advantages and disadvantages that can be gleaned from these real-world examples. Such an analysis is critical in a review paper because it provides the reader with a balanced understanding of the field, including its strengths, weaknesses, and areas of controversy or ongoing research.

In essence, the paper could benefit from more synthesis and analysis following the presentation of examples and facts, which would create a clearer, more complete picture of 5G MBB services.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, I agree.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, I agree.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the comments for the body of the paper.
