

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125722
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of radio reconnaissance receivers designed on the basis of solid-state filters
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
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.	The paper lacks a clearly articulated scientific basis and presentation of its scientific contribution. Significant revisions and redefinition are necessary to meet the quality required for publication. In the introduction, it is essential to include the research rationale and define the research methods. The conclusion should incorporate the scientific contribution of the paper, the importance of the research, the relevance of the obtained results, and outline future research directions and continuation of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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.	The article abstract lacks comprehensiveness. The first paragraph of the abstract presents general information about radio intelligence systems, which should be moved to the introduction. The abstract should specify the methods used in the study, emphasize the significance of the research, and provide a single sentence summarizing the results. The abstract should be revised in accordance with the guidelines.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the article is appropriate.	
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.	The abstract contains sentences identical to those at the beginning of the introduction; the abstract should be modified. The introduction is too lengthy relative to the rest of the paper, comprising nearly 50% of the content. In the introduction, where the main components of radio intelligence systems are listed, it is stated that Electronic Warfare Tactics are part of radio reconnaissance, which is inaccurate as electronic warfare tactics represent a broader concept. Sources must be cited for any images used; if the images are the author's work, this should also be noted. The paper does not clearly articulate its scientific contribution. Consistent terminology should be used throughout; for example, the title refers to "radio reconnaissance receivers," while the abstract and introduction use "radio intelligence systems," and later sections revert to "radio reconnaissance receivers." It is recommended to include a table comparing the characteristics of radio reconnaissance receivers used by different military forces. Some spelling errors need correction, such as in the title of the second section. The conclusion is too brief given the paper's structure, lacking in the scientific contributions and rationale of the study. The paper requires substantial revision and expansion to improve its quality. I recommend that it not be published in its current form.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references used in the article should be expanded to enhance its quality.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is necessary to correct certain spelling errors in the paper.	
Optional/General comments	There are no conflicts of interest in this 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marko Radovanovic
Department, University & Country	University of Defence, Military Academy, Serbia