Date: 03/15/2009 [11:40:42 PM CET]
From: EDAS <help@edas-help.com>
To Ardian Ulvan <ulvana1@fel.cvut.cz>
Subject: [IFIPAICT] Article #1569201669 has been registered

Dear Dr. Ardian Ulvan

Thank you for registering your article 1569201669 ('The Efficiency Performance on Handover's Scanning Process of IEEE802.16m') to IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology (Springer journal/book series. You still have to upload your manuscript, using either web upload or ftp.

- Via web form upload: http://edas.info/uploadPaper.php?m=1569201669

- Via ftp: You can upload the manuscript to ftp://ftp.edas.info, using the file name 1569201669(You MUST use the manuscript number, not some other file name.)

You can see all your submissions and their status at

http://edas.info

using your EDAS user id ulvana1@fel.cvut.cz.

Once you upload your manuscript, you will receive another email confirmation. Confirmations for ftp submissions may take up to one hour since the ftp directory is swept only periodically.

Regards,
Zoubir Mammeri, Editor in chief
Jozef Wozniak, Editor

Date: 03/15/2009 [11:41:32 PM CET]
From: EDAS <help@edas-help.com>
To Ardian Ulvan <ulvana1@fel.cvut.cz>
Subject: [IFIPAICT] Article #1569201669 has been uploaded

Dear Dr. Ardian Ulvan

Thank you for uploading your article 1569201669 ('The Efficiency Performance on Handover's Scanning Process of IEEE802.16m') to IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology (Springer journal/book series). The article is of type application/pdf and has a length of 237293 bytes.

You can modify your paper at

http://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1569201669

and see all your submissions at

http://edas.info

using the EDAS identifier ulvana1@fel.cvut.cz

Regards,

Zoubir Mammeri, Editor in chief
Jozef Wozniak, Editor

Date: 07/01/2009 [11:30:16 PM CEST]
From: EDAS <help@edas-help.com>
To Ardian Ulvan <ulvana1@fel.cvut.cz>
Subject: [IFIPAICT] Your article #1569201669 has been accepted

Dear Dr. Ardian Ulvan

The review process for IFIP Advances on Information and Communication Technology has been completed. We have received a number of quality articles and due to the space limitations of the planned volume of Springer IFIP-AICT, could accept only slightly above 30 articles.

We are pleased to inform that your paper #1569201669, titled 'The Efficiency Performance on Handover's Scanning Process of IEEE802.16m', has received favorable reviews and is being considered for publication at IFIP-AICT (Springer journal/book series) volume 308, which is expected to be published online on September 2009.

The reviewers seem to have pointed out some weaknesses and/or possible improvements in regard to your paper, which has led the Editors to issue the above qualified statement. Please read carefully the enclosed reviews, or at http://edas.info/showPaper.php?m=1569201669 using your EDAS login, and try as much as possible to take the advice given.

We do hope you will be able to upload the camera-ready version by July 15, 2009, along with the filled in Springer copyright form. The maximum size of final manuscript is 20 pages (however, we do allow up to four extra pages at a cost of 100 € per extra page) according to Springer format. When you prepare your final manuscript, please read carefully and follow the "Information for authors" available at https://link.springer.com/ifipaict/308. Note that articles received after that date cannot be included in the issued journal.

We look forward to receiving from you.

Regards,

Zoubir Mammeri, Editor in chief
Jozef Wozniak, Editor

======= Review 1 =======

| *** Relevance to IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology: How well does the paper fit into the scope of journal?

Good (3)

| *** Technical issues: Do you consider the paper technically sound?

Fair (2)

| *** Presentation: How well the paper is presented?

Fair (2)

| *** Originality: Do you consider the work original?

Original (3)

| *** Contributions: Do you consider the contributions (in terms of theory or practice) and/or experimentation/simulation results?

Fair (2)

| *** Overall recommendation: Your overall rating.

Weak accept (2)

| *** Familiarity: Rate your familiarity with the topic of the paper.

Expert (4)

| *** Strengths: What are the major reasons to accept the paper? [Be brief.]

New technical issue for mobile Wimax (IEEE802.16m)

| *** Weaknesses: What are the most important reasons NOT to accept the paper? [Be brief.]

Lack of justification of some simulation assumptions.

| *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the Editors forassessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

This work studies the efficiency of various scanning and handover procedures possible for IEEE802.16m. The level of analysis is moderate. Despite it has been written in fair English, the proofread is still required. The organization of the article is a bit mess, some figures are too blurry, it should be improved.

======= Review 2 =======

| *** Relevance to IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology: How well does the paper fit into the scope of journal?

Good (3)

| *** Technical issues: Do you consider the paper technically sound?

Good (3)

| *** Presentation: How well the paper is presented?

Good (3)

| *** Originality: Do you consider the work original?

Original (3)

| *** Contributions: Do you consider the contributions (in terms of theory or practice) and/or experimentation/simulation results?

Good (3)

| *** Overall recommendation: Your overall rating.

Accept (3)

| *** Familiarity: Rate your familiarity with the topic of the paper.

Expert (4)

| *** Strengths: What are the major reasons to accept the paper? [Be brief.]

The authors have brought a breakthrough issue in IEEE802.16m which is recently discussed in mobile and wireless world. The proposed scanning processes are significant to be included in the standard.

| *** Weaknesses: What are the most important reasons NOT to accept the paper? [Be brief.]

It seems a very early works, the proof of technology came from the simulation results is still far from really. Several assumptions that have been carried out are unrealistic.

| *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the Editors forassessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper compares a number of handover scanning alternatives for IEEE 802.16m. Although the comparison is interesting, some technical words and terminology should be significantly improved to make the text more readable.

The analysis is quite comprehensive. However, it remains unclear where Eq 4, 5, and 6 come from, i.e., they should be better explained, and it should be argued why this is a good description of system behaviour. The reason for using the factors of 5 in Eq. 7 through 10 also remain unclear.

Although the analysis is interesting, the paper is lacking validation of the model. A simple model, like the one presented is attractive, but should be better justified. Now the equations are not convincingly explained, nor is a validation of the model, e.g., by means of simulation given.

======= Review 3 =======

| *** Relevance to IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology: How well does the paper fit into the scope of journal?

Good (3)

| *** Technical issues: Do you consider the paper technically sound?

Good (3)

| *** Presentation: How well the paper is presented?

Fair (2)

| *** Originality: Do you consider the work original?

Original (3)

| *** Contributions: Do you consider the contributions (in terms of theory or practice) and/or experimentation/simulation results?

Good (3)

| *** Overall recommendation: Your overall rating.

Accept (3)

| *** Familiarity: Rate your familiarity with the topic of the paper.

Expert (4)

| *** Strengths: What are the major reasons to accept the paper? [Be brief.]

The novelty of the work, and its potential contribution for the development of IEEE802.16m standard technology.

| *** Weaknesses: What are the most important reasons NOT to accept the paper? [Be brief.]

Simple model and some uncredible assumptions.

| *** Detailed Comments: Please provide detailed comments that will be helpful to the Editors forassessing the paper. Also provide feedback to the authors.

The paper presents some interesting results. However, there are some English problems in the paper. It should be read and corrected by native English (proof reader). Examples: “the handover bring … and also cause …”, “… and assign our future work.”, “… havecontribute to…”, “… to cope these issues.”, and “the fourth tupe…”. How equations 5 and 6 are are found? This needs more explanation. The second half of page 7 is empty.