

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Improvement of Block Product Turbo Coding by using a new concept of Soft Hamming Decoder	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0649/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>The title is very clear and it represents the content of the article which presents a new concept for the soft decoding of the Hamming code and BPTC code.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract contains a small introduction about the topic of FEC and then it introduces the new idea of its work and finally a small comparison about result improvements is stated.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There aren't any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods introduced here are clear and simple, but they should not be separated by comments about results.</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the work is very clear , but maybe the author should reduce the part about Hamming code introduction since it is very known.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>In the conclusion, the author represents a good comparison and analysis of the new concept presented here with the oldest ones represented in the literature. Also the conclusion was very adequate with the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: