Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Prince Chigozie, Electronics and Computer Unit, Department of Physics, University of Calabar, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Alaa Ghaith, Electronics and Physics Department, Faculty of Sciences I, Lebanese University Beirut, Lebanon

Reviewer 3: David L. la Red Martínez, Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/6/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/6/2020
Manuscript Title: Implementation of Convolutional codes with Viterbi decoding in Satellite communication link using Matlab computational software.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0678/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The tittle of the paper is very clear and it is very relevant and adequate of the article's content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The abstract clearly presents the objective, method and result obtained. Although	

the author needs to recast this statement on the abstract "Satellite communication links utilizes broadband services and promises efficient data transmission in order to achieve reliable system performance".	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
The methodology used is quite understandable and precise	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
The body of the paper is precise and unambiguous	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The author personalized the conclusion which is not the actual way of concluding an article or report. He needs to recast the conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The references are comprehensive and appropriate enough for the article under review.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): The author should recast the conclusion. The abstract and conclusion of a paper help readers who might not have the patience to read through the whole work to have an idea of what the article is all about. It is also the most authors' source of literature. Thus, the conclusion should be adjusted to give an over view of the work.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Implementation of Convolutional codes with Viterbi decoding in Satellite communication link using Matlab computational software	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0678/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**2**

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	**X**

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This subject has been studied well a long time ago by a lot of researchers, so it is not adequate for research in this period

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: David L. la Red Martínez	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional del Nordeste / Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Implementation of Convolutional codes with Viterbi decoding in Satellite communication link using Matlab computational software	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 78.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is appropriate and relevant to the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
Abstract is suitable. It should improve the description of the results.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Writing is correct.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Yes.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Yes.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Yes, but it should be extended. They should also be added to future lines of work.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
References are appropriate. it would be appropriate to add more recent references to publications of the JCR index.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The work is interesting but would improve if the comments made are applied.