

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_104976
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis, Simulation, and Evaluation of Voice over Internet Protocol
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>This is a good study.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, contains all needed elements in abstract.</p> <p>Introduction section is too lengthy please subdivide into background of study with specific topics.</p> <p>Yes, this study provides proper analysis and result from the simulations.</p> <p>Refs are sufficient, however most of them are quite outdated. Include more recent refs in reviewing the study background.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is good and it is a well written paper.	
Optional/General comments	Please refer to the comments stated in the article.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siti Zulaiha Ahmad
Department, University & Country	College of Computing, Informatics and Mathematics, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia