

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_110800
Title of the Manuscript:	Distance-Distributed Energy Efficient Clustering (D-DEEC) routing protocol for wireless sensor network
Type of the Article	

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-This work addresses the problem of energy efficiency of sensor nodes and network lifetime, which is the major problem in WSNs, by proposing a solution based on the distance between the nodes and the base station which represents an important factor when designing such a network. Therefore, this work seems important for scientific community.</p> <p>2- The title is the name of the solution and it is clear. It is suitable.</p> <p>3- The abstract is well detailed, with the problem presentation in the beginning and the shortcomings, the proposed solution and its advantages at the end.</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure are clear. However, I propose adding a state of the art section to detail old work and why not make a comparative table, which represents the advantages and disadvantages of each. The author only details the work from DEEC, but other works must be proposed, that uses distance as a CH selection criterion.</p> <p>5- Yes, I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- The references are not very recent and not sufficient, but as I already mentioned in (4-), it is better to add other works which are of geographical routing protocol which take into consideration the distance as a selection criterion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1- Take the help of someone specialized in English to correct the different parts.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>** I see that it is necessary to add a state of the art section to list the various recent works and even to break down this section according to the types of protocols. In addition, putting a comparative table at the end like that will make the work enriching.</p> <p>** The author compared his solution with a single protocol (TDEEC); I propose to add another protocol to clearly highlight the performance of his proposal.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chaima Bejaoui
Department, University & Country	National Engineering School of Sfax, Sfax University, Tunisia