



George Corser <gcorser@gmail.com>

Michigan Academician Decision for Manuscript #michacad-D-14-00019

Roy Cole <em@editorialmanager.com>
Reply-To: Roy Cole <coler@gvsu.edu>
To: George Corser <gpcorser@svsu.edu>

Fri, Jun 5, 2015 at 9:07 AM

CC: coler@gvsu.edu

Dear George Corser,

We are delighted to accept this manuscript for publication in an early issue of Michigan Academician. We will likely suggest minor changes in wording, but otherwise we plan to publish this version of the manuscript substantially as submitted.

You will next hear from one of our associate editors who will copy edit the manuscript and consult with you about any suggested changes. The copy editing stage is the final time at which you can make corrections to your work without incurring change charges. Such changes should be restricted to issues raised by the copy editor; do not plan to introduce substantive new content that could circumvent the peer review process. Once you approve copy edits we will schedule the article for publication and submit an issue to our printer for composition. You will have the opportunity to check PDF proofs, but corrections in proof should be limited to printer's errors.

Again, congratulations on this good work and many thanks for submitting this manuscript to the Michigan Academician.

Very sincerely,

Roy Cole, Ph.D.
Associate Editor
Michigan Academician

Reviewer #1: 1. Does the paper reflect overall quality in form and content? Does it require substantial revision? Does it contribute markedly to scholarship and/or understanding? Does it present new research or combine known material in a novel context? Explain.

Yes, the paper is organized, clear, and study important issue. No, I believe the paper does not require substantial revision.

2. Does the paper convincingly accomplish what it sets out to prove? As far as you know, are the facts, references, quotations, figures, and tables (if applicable) accurate?

Yes the paper is prove what it sets out and what the author used from fact, references, etc. are accurate.

3. Is the paper poorly written or badly organized, whatever the merits of its content? Could the title be improved or sharpened?

No, the paper written professionally organized and the title is good.

4. Could the paper in any way be shortened and still remain as effective? If applicable, can any of the figures or tables be deleted, or would you suggest the addition of either?

The size of the paper is good and the idea is clear. No, the figures and tables help reader to understand all concepts.

5. If you believe that someone else should also pass judgment on this paper, whom do you recommend? Also please suggest other journal(s) that might consider this paper should the Michigan Academician not be able to publish it.

No. I suggest IEEE.

6. Do you have any additional suggestions for improvement?

No, the paper is very clear.

