

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_119091</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring Performance Metrics of OFDM, F-OFDM, FBMC, and UFMC Modulation Techniques for 5G Wireless Communication in Terms of PSD, BER, and SNR</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community. Communication is very important right now</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title of the article is very appropriate</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the article's summary is comprehensive and expanded</b></p> <p>4. <b>Subsections: The third section should be called theory rather than methodology and the rest of the manuscript structure is appropriate</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct, but it does not present anything new or an innovative thesis</b></p> <p>6. <b>References are sufficient, appropriate and up-to-date</b> You may need two or three sources for appropriate comparison with sources based on the same study and topics in order for the writer to demonstrate the superiority of his paper.</p> <p><b>This section is unnecessary and an addition that the paper does not need ( 3.5 Evaluated Parameters)</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 language is okay</p> <p>It may need further checking</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors need to make two important things clear: 1- What's new? What is the scientific contribution of the paper? The methodology used is not accurate and is a review of theory You need to define the purpose of the paper and a clear research methodology. 2- The second thing is to compare the methodology and results with related work and with clear tables.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>Ali Kareem Nahar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Technology, Iraq</b>