



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_45303
Title of the Manuscript:	An Improved Logistic Function for Mapping Raw Scores of Perceptual Evaluation of Speech Quality (PESQ)
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	<p>THIS COMMENT IS FOR THE EDITOR. I mentioned that before, the manuscript should be formatted for review with one column and line numbers. It is not possible to refer to line# and make comments. Example (line 22 the word xxx should be expressed as YYY). Please make sure the editor provide the right format for review. The format for publication should not be reviewer concern. Thank you.</p> <p>please make this paper clearer and explain your results (learning and testing data)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It is not clear about "192 transmitted speeches was developed", You mention 64 originals, from where the 192 came from? Did you process it to increase the data base to 192. Please clarify the abstract (change Was -> were)</p> <p>Page 1 the continuation of the paragraph looks like "not easily quality" should be corrected Also, it is a running sentence please brake to two.</p> <p>" between 1 for bad quality to 5' should change to "and 5" "sample transmitted or processed speeches does not occupy this same range of quality score as that of Subjective MOS score." Not a clear sentence and wrong grammar. From this point I'm not going to correct the grammar. Please let a native English speaker to go over the manuscript. There are many run on sentences.</p> <p>Check formulas 1 and 2 (4.999 – 0.999) are you missing a variable in the denominator? Or it is just 4. What is the resining to show it like this? Should be explained.</p> <p>Please increase the quality of the figures. Table 1 header should be clear.</p> <p>The experiment is not clear: It is important to state what data you use for the development of the algorithm and what data was used for testing. You stated 64 subject data and unclear 192 segments ? (please explain what is the 192) What portion of the data is used for learning (develop the test cases) and what was used to test.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ohad BarSimanTov</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Binghamton University, United States</i>