

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_98959
Title of the Manuscript:	Specific Attenuation Estimation in Perturbed Radio Wave Propagation using Artificial Neural Networks
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:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Yes, this manuscript is important to the scientific community</b>  <b>The manuscript is good and consistent as it discusses an important societal issue and the basic idea in the manuscript is clear, as the Savior covers the subject of the study. The introduction is also clear.</b> 2. <b>The title of the article for this manuscript is appropriate</b>  3. <b>The article summary of this manuscript is comprehensive, as it clearly discusses the objectives, methodology, and results, which are considered the main keys in the manuscript, and which show the originality and quality of the manuscript.</b>  4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</b>  5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct</b>  6. <b>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The quality of language in this manuscript is appropriate for scholarly communication</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khidir Shaib Mohamed
Department, University & Country	College of Sciences and Arts, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia, College of Science, Dalanj University, Sudan