

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_121325
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF DELAY IN ZIGBEE WSN FOR SMART HOME APPLICATIONS
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Observed Template mistakes. No uniformity in sections and subsections. This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of delay in Zigbee Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) specifically for smart home applications. Understanding and mitigating delay is crucial for enhancing the performance and reliability of smart home systems, which rely on timely data transmission for automation and security. I appreciate this manuscript for its practical relevance and its potential to influence future advancements in smart home network design.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, covering the role of WSNs in smart homes, the application of the IEEE 802.15.4/ZigBee standard, and the factors contributing to delays in ZigBee-based WSNs. However, it could benefit from some refinements for clarity and completeness. Here are a few suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emphasize the Purpose and Findings: Clearly state the main objective and key findings of the study to give readers a succinct understanding of its contributions. 2. Add Quantitative Insights: If available, include quantitative results or improvements observed in delay reduction or performance enhancement. 3. Improve Flow and Structure: Ensure a logical flow of ideas, starting with the context, followed by the problem, methodology, results, and conclusions. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are not generally appropriate, there is room for improvement to enhance clarity and readability. The author has not provided a detailed explanation of the methodology, specifically how the delay analysis was conducted in the Zigbee WSN. This lack of methodological clarity makes it difficult to fully understand the basis of the simulation results presented.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This manuscript can demonstrate scientific correctness by meticulously detailing the factors contributing to delays in Zigbee WSNs within smart home applications. • Additionally, the manuscript's findings can be supported by comprehensive data and clear explanations, ensuring the conclusions to real-world smart home scenarios. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Incorporating more recent and relevant papers in the reference section would strengthen the manuscript's foundation and context.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO The manuscript would benefit from significant improvements in both the clarity of the English language and the overall quality of the content.	
Optional/General comments	The author has primarily explained the basics of Zigbee without providing a clear and detailed analysis of delay in Zigbee WSNs. The manuscript lacks in-depth exploration of the factors affecting delay and how these were specifically addressed in the study. A more thorough analysis and discussion on delay, supported by robust data and methodological clarity, would significantly improve the quality and impact of the manuscript. The explanation of the results is not sufficiently detailed or effective, leading to challenges in comprehending the findings clearly. The manuscript also lacks a well-defined conclusion and a section outlining future research directions. Instead of offering recommendations, the author should present a precise conclusion and articulate the future scope of the research.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jamuna M
Department, University & Country	Bangalore Institute of Technology, India