



## Review Manuscript

- Click the "HTML" button to view the online version of the manuscript; click the "PDF" button to view a printer-friendly version of the manuscript.
- Be sure to read the reviewer instructions on the "Instructions" tab.
- Navigate to the "Score Sheet" tab to access the reviewer form. Be sure to click "Save" at the bottom of the scoresheet to retain your work in the system.
- To submit your review, click the "Submit" button at the bottom of the score sheet.

[Instructions](#) [Details](#) [Score Sheet](#)

Title: Resource Efficient LDPC Decoders for Multimedia Communication

Status: AE: Not Assigned

Manuscript ID: MM-003854

Authors: Arkalgud Chandrasetty, Vikram (contact); Aziz, Syed Mahfuzul

Suggested Category: ICME 2011

Date Submitted: 21-Sep-2011 (Last Updated: 25-Oct-2011)

Total Time in Review: 35 days, 5 hours

[HTML](#) [PDF](#) [Original Files](#) [Abstract](#) [External Searches](#) [?](#)

The IEEE Transactions prepared under the auspices of the IEEE Signal Processing Society publish original, comprehensive, in-depth technical papers for knowledgeable readers including researchers and practitioners. The papers are of long-range interest and are significant to the signal processing and related disciplines. All submitted papers undergo multiple, rigorous, "blind" peer review. The transactions are:

IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing  
 IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing  
 IEEE Transactions on Image Processing  
 IEEE Transactions on Multimedia (a joint publication of the IEEE Circuits and Systems, Signal Processing, Communications, and Computer Societies)  
 IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing  
 IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security

As a participant in the peer review of this manuscript, you are required to complete this form and return it, within six weeks of receipt of the manuscript, to the Signal Processing Society Publications Office. Your comments will assist the associate editor in determining the final disposition of the manuscript, and will be used to assist the author in refinement of the manuscript. Your identity will be held in confidence from the author.

### A. Suitability of Topic

#### 1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in these transactions?

- Yes  
 Perhaps  
 No

#### 2. Is the topic important to colleagues working in the field?

- Yes  
 Moderately So  
 No (explain):

### B. Content

#### 1. Is the paper technically sound?

- Yes

No (why not?)

**2. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?**

- Yes
- Important Information is missing or superficially treated.
- Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so.
- Certain parts significantly overstressed.

**3. How would you describe technical depth of paper?**

- Superficial
- Suitable for the non-specialist
- Appropriate for the Generally Knowledgeable Individual Working in the Field or a Related Field
- Suitable only for an expert

**4. How would you rate the technical novelty of the paper?**

- Novel
- Somewhat Novel
- Not Novel

**C. Presentation**

**1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?**

- Satisfactory
- Could be improved
- Poor

**2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?**

- Yes
- No (explain):

**3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript.**

- Yes
- No

**4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?**

- Yes
- Not always
- No

**5. How do you rate the English usage?**

- Satisfactory
- Needs improvement
- Poor

**6. Rate the Bibliography**

- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory (explain):

**D. Overall Rating**

**1. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?**

- Excellent
- Good

Fair

Poor

**2. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?**

Highly Novel

Sufficiently Novel

Slightly Novel

Not Novel

**3. How would you rate the "literary" presentation of the paper?**

Totally Accessible

Mostly Accessible

Partially Accessible

Inaccessible

**4. How would you rate the appropriateness of this paper for publication in this IEEE Transactions?**

Excellent Match

Good Match

Weak Match

Poor Match

**req Recommendation**

A - Publish Unaltered

AQ - Publish in Minor, Required Changes

RQ - Review Again After Major Changes

R1 - Reject (Paper is not of sufficient quality or novelty to be published in this Transactions)

R2 - Reject (A major rewrite is required. Author should be encouraged to resubmit rewritten paper at some later time.)

R3 - Reject (Paper is seriously flawed; do not encourage resubmission.)

**Comments**

Confidential Comments to the Associate Editor

Please also use this section to 1) provide names and contact information for others qualified to review this paper; 2) let us know if this paper is a candidate for an award for outstanding quality and why.

Comments to Author

Please state why you rated the paper as you did in the sections above. If you have indicated that revisions are required, please give the author specific guidance regarding those revisions, differentiating between optional and mandatory changes.

**Attach a File** no file selected**Files attached**

- No files have been uploaded.

 Save as Draft  Submit 

ScholarOne Manuscripts™ v4.7.0 (patent #7,257,767 and #7,263,655). © ScholarOne, Inc., 2011. All Rights Reserved.  
ScholarOne Manuscripts is a trademark of ScholarOne, Inc. ScholarOne is a registered trademark of ScholarOne, Inc.

[Terms and Conditions of Use](#) - [ScholarOne Privacy Policy](#) - [Get Help Now](#)