



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_12616
Title of the Manuscript:	A Multi-Antenna Design Scheme based on Hadamard Matrices for Wireless Communications
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	There is a similar paper published Online January 2014 (http://www.scirp.org/journal/ijcns) http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ijcns.2014.71005 A Simplified Improvement on the Design of QO-STBC Based on Hadamard Matrices K. O. O. Anoh¹, Y. A. S. Dama^{1,2}, R. A. A. Abd-Alhameed¹, S. M. R. Jones¹ The mathematical model is very similar to the presented here. In the published paper appear 2 graphs and in the paper under peer review 3. The two graphs which appear in both papers are extremely similar. Here, it was added a curve about old DHSTBC, but the curves associated with the proposal called new QO-STBC, which appears in both papers, has the following characteristics: • Comparison of new QO-STBC with traditional QO-STBC and interference-free QO-STBC (4×1) has the same shape and values to the presented in figure 2 of the paper under peer review (figure 1 in published one). • Comparison of new QO-STBC with traditional QO-STBC and interference-free QO-STBC (3×1), has only a really small variation on bit error ratio values since 20 EbN0 (dB), figure 3 here and number 1 in the published paper The really small variation detected not appear significant on the proposal of new QO-STBC.	Thank you for your comments. It seems to me that you may have not followed the mathematical concepts that underlay our study carefully. Yes, the work appeared similar (as you can as well see in other studies that have used Hadamard matrices approach most of which referred in this study) but the mathematical novelties are unique and advantageous, that is why they are put up.
Minor REVISION comments	BER, QPSK, EbN0 was used without the previous definition of the acronyms.	Thank you. They are now defined before usage in the revised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In line 89, the equation number of the cited equation is wrong. In Figures 1-3, the Y axis name cannot be read, please check. In conclusions, on line 279, specify if property must be change to plural or mention the specific property. In line 322, reference 22 is incomplete.	The equation has been corrected. Thank you. Thank you. The figures have been resized, and they are quite readable now. It is modified. Thank you. The reference has been updated. Thank you.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		