



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5131
Title of the Manuscript:	OUTAGE ANALYSIS OF A MULTI-USER SPATIAL DIVERSITY SYSTEM IN A SHADOW-FADE PROPAGATING CHANNEL
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The most important of all, this work's novelty and contribution are not properly clarified. The author should compare the proposed approach with other recently works or provide a discussion. Otherwise, it's hard for reader to identify the novelty and contribution of this work. 2. The most references are out of date. Author would add more recently works and discuss the recently development. 3. The descriptions given in simulation settings are not sufficient.	1- In the revised, last 4 paragraphs of the introduction is now dedicated to explaining the contributions of the paper. The paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the introduction are used to introduce the related work, however, their approach are different and they do not use outage probability for the performance analysis, therefore there is no results to be compared. 2- The references are updated. 7 of the recent papers are added at the end. 3- Please find the new description in the revised version.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The abstract is too general and not prepared objectively. It should briefly highlight paper's novelty as what is the main problem, how has it been resolved and where the novelty lies. 2. The manuscript reads as a book chapter rather than a technical paper. Author should provide only relevant information related to this paper and reserve more space for the proposed model.	1- The contributions and novelties of the paper are mentioned in the introduction of the paper. 2- In the revised version, I tried to avoid using "sections" and made various minor changes so that the doesn't seem like a book chapter.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In this paper, the author proposed an outage analysis for multi-user spatial diversity relay wireless system. The model seems promising and the simulation experiments demonstrate the effectiveness. However, the reviewer could not find out their novelty and new contributions.	