

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JERR_102647</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Ultra-Wideband Metamaterial-based Rectangular Microstrip Antenna for Sub-6 GHz 5G and other Microwave Applications</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>  |

### **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> )

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community since it presents an important investigation on metamaterial antennas.</p> <p>Yes, I think the title is suitable for this paper since it corresponds to the topic developed in the text.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is well written and it is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, I think the sections and the subsections are well named. So, they are appropriate. However, they are not well developed. The authors should add more described text and the appropriated references. The last paragraph of the introduction should present the different sections of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct since all the elements needed are presented in the manuscript. But, they are not well detailed. The figures presented here should be well described in detail. The authors should describe what they see in the plots. Each figure should be related to some physical process. Each result presented as figure should be compared to theoretical, numerical and experimental investigations previously obtained in literature.</p> <p>The manuscript only two recent references (2022), I think this topic is wildly developed in literature. So, the authors should add more recent references related to antennas and metamaterials.</p> <p>I think this manuscript can have <b>2/6 points</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>The quality of English is poor. The paper should be revised and the topos and grammatical errors should be well checked. The language should be improved to be suitable for scholarly communications</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>1) The paper is not well referenced. Only the introduction presents sufficient references. The rest of the paper is not referenced. Similar investigations have been wildly studied in literature. Consequently, it is not possible to present such works related to the design of metamaterial antenna without references. I recommend to the authors to add several actual works related to this topic recently published. The rest of the paper should be significantly referenced.</p> <p>2) The manuscript presents several long sentences which make the comprehension of the text very difficult. It is recommended to make short sentences to improve the general comprehension of the manuscript. The level of English should meet the journal's standard. Please check for grammatical and spelling errors, and poorly constructed sentences, and refine the language carefully.</p> <p>3) In their analysis, the authors should explain in detail what they really observed in their plots</p>   |   |

Review Form 1.7

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>and they should connect the curves to some physical process. The results should be linked to existed physical studies and associated with corresponding references.</p> <p>For the reasons aforementioned, my opinion is that this manuscript is not suitable for publication in <b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b> in this present aspect. I recommend major revisions. If the manuscript is revised, I will be happy to reconsider my decision.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <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:                            | <b>Bedel Giscard Onana Essama</b>      |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Ebolowa, Cameroon</b> |