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

> \*\*\* Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper?

The authors analyzed cooperative MIMO for WSNS, proposed node selection scheme and a corresponding MAC protocol.

> \*\*\* Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1. The presentation of this paper needs to be improved. For example, there are typos in "index term". "consumption energy" -> "energy consumption". "figure ??" on pp.1

2. Most sensor nodes have constrained resources (e.g. computation, communications, memory, etc.) and MIMO may be too heavy to be implemented in constrained sensor nodes.

3. Cooperative MIMO is not new. In addition, there is no performance comparison between the proposed node selection & MAC protocol with existing peer schemes.

> \*\*\* Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

1. As a paper submitted to SmartGridComm, it will be nice if the authors can include a real smart grid use case in the paper to justify the practical usage of MIMO for WSNs.

2. To address the weaknesses mentioned above.

> \*\*\* Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Acceptable (3)

> \*\*\* Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the

analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> \*\*\* Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> \*\*\* Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)

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

> \*\*\* Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper?

Make some analysis on the cooperative mimo in WSN.

> \*\*\* Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

1.      In the 1st paragraph of intro section, author mentioned that “The major performance setback of the wireless communication systems is the multipaths fading phenomena.” Then, they talked about “multiple transmit and/or receive antennas introduces diversity (spatial, time, frequency or polarization). To be frank, the diversity introduced by multiple antennas has nothing to be do with how to deal with the multipath fading.

2.      Lot of typos and grammar error exist in this paper, e.g.,

----This transmission impairment degrades the system link performance, however, the utilization

------“the inherent background Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) is constantly present”

------We adopt the two-state Markov-Gaussian impulsive noise model shown in figure ??

-----The solutions for the BPSK [11] and 4-QAM are given in 9 and 10, and 11

The well-known precoder method is applied in this paper. Moreover, the full CSI is needed, which lacks of implementation feasibility. Therefore, based on this assumption, there is little meaning to investigate how to reduce the complexity and energy.

4.

> \*\*\* Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

Too many stuffs are linked together without the reasonable logic. It is gusted to only focus on one of the points, e.g., cooperative scheme, or mac protocol improvement instead of mixing all of them together.

> \*\*\* Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Little (2)

> \*\*\* Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the

analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> \*\*\* Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Minor variations on a well investigated subject. (2)

> \*\*\* Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Substantial revision work is needed. (2)

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

> \*\*\* Strong aspects: Comments to the author: what are the strong aspects of the paper?

The paper incorporates impulse noise into the cooperative WSN communications model.

> \*\*\* Weak aspects: Comments to the author: what are the weak aspects of the paper?

The paper has the following weaknesses:

1) Teh techniques used are arguably a little too powerful for an embedded WSN system. Given the complexity, I would have expected a complexity calculus/comparison which is absent.

2) The underlying assumptions are entirely unrealistic, including the assumption on full channel state information, a sufficient density of nodes so that relay nodes are available, among others.

3) I am very concerned about the fact that the authors have assumed an ergodic channel given that for static WSN the channel is largely non-ergodic and for which other KPIs, such as outage, are more appropriate.

4) The performance gains are rather disappointing and question the entire usage of the invoked technique and technologies.

5) The MAC protocol is a rather simple version of prior designed cooperative MAC protocols, much of which has been ignored by the authors.

6) The paper is full of typos, such as "figure ??", "Iinformation", spaces before commas,

> \*\*\* Recommended changes: Recommended changes. Please indicate any changes that should be made to the paper if accepted.

My recommendation is to address above weaknesses, before the paper can be published.

> \*\*\* Relevance and timeliness: Rate the importance and timeliness of the topic addressed in the paper within its area of research.

Little (2)

> \*\*\* Technical content and scientific rigour: Rate the technical content of the paper (e.g.: completeness of the

analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the treatise, accuracy of the models, etc.), its soundness and scientific rigour.

Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws. (2)

> \*\*\* Novelty and originality: Rate the novelty and originality of the ideas or results presented in the paper.

Some interesting ideas and results on a subject well investigated. (3)

> \*\*\* Quality of presentation: Rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures, the completeness and accuracy of references.

Readable, but revision is needed in some parts. (3)