

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_96220
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Algorithm for Energy Consumption of Component base Distributed Computing in 5G 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) The manuscript title states for 5G networks but the detail work of the Authors are not really related to their initial target and is not significantly important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2) The Authors better compare the algorithms and optimize them. Thus, My suggestion will be “ Comparison and optimization of energy efficient algorithms for component base distributed computing in 5G networks”</p> <p>3) The Abstract lacks basic problem, methodology and major findings</p> <p>4) The subsections and structures are appropriate</p> <p>5) Authors do not add anything new. They have discussed the already existing algorithms without major contribution.</p> <p>6) 68% of the references are from year of 2013 and 2014. Thus, references are not recent.</p> <p>1) Even if the comparison is recommended for 5G, nothing is mentioned and tested to 5G networks. They have taken CPU, RAM, motherboard energy consumption. If the Work will be considered, they have to think to test and compare recent algorithms on 5G networks.</p> <p>2) Symbols of Bellman-Ford Algorithm are not levelled well. For example V,E,e_1,e_2 and others</p> <p>3) The Bellman-Ford Algorithm is not properly described for shortest path selection</p> <p>4) clearly show the input, output, and detail process of Dijkstra algorithm</p> <p>5) Flow chart 1 should be amended based on the two algorithms and the entire task of the research</p> <p>6)Include the system model</p> <p>7)The total energy of Table 4 is not correct (It has to be 746 W not 650 W)</p> <p>8) Support the tabular data by formula and mathematical analysis.</p> <p>9) Graph- 2 is not correct especially for the total energy. Correct it</p> <p>9) Symbols of Bellman-Ford Algorithm are not levelled well. For example V,E,e_1,e_2 and others</p> <p>10) The Bellman-Ford Algorithm is not properly described for shortest path selection</p> <p>11) clearly show the input, output, and detail process of Dijkstra algorithm</p> <p>12) Flow chart 1 should be amended based on the two algorithms and the entire task of the research</p> <p>13)Include the system model</p> <p>14)The total energy of Table 4 is not correct (It has to be 746 W not 650 W)</p> <p>15) Support the tabular data by formula and mathematical analysis.</p> <p>16) Graph- 2 is not correct especially for the total energy. Correct it</p> <p>17) Include optimization part</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It needs further polishing and prof read	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fikreslam Gared Mengsitu
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia