

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_118394</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Design and Analysis of a Dual-Band Microstrip Patch Antenna for Sub-6 GHz Applications</b>
Type of the Article	

### **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> (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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.Yes. This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community due to its relevance to modern wireless communication systems, including 5G and IoT. A well-designed dual-band antenna can significantly enhance the performance of these systems by providing better coverage, higher data rates, and improved reliability.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive but headings in the abstract section can be omitted or need to be reviewed for alternate heading names. Additionally, keywords are missing in the abstract. Generally 4-6 keywords need to be mentioned.</p> <p>4. Subsections are appropriate, but structure is not good. After giving the design parameters and dimensions, author jumps to the final design. Dimensions were given for the base design. We can see in the diagram that there are slots or truncation on antenna patch and ground, but the information and steps are missing. And there is no comparison of the results and performance with the previous research.</p> <p>5. yes</p> <p>6.. References should be added to compare the performance of designed antenna to previous latest designs.</p> <p>Additional suggestions: 1.The word “development” is used in the whole manuscript but there is no proof of physical development of the antenna. Therefore, instead of “development” the word “design” is more suitable as this manuscript presents the design and simulation of antenna not the physical development. 2. Results can be compared with the previous research papers to show the importance of this new design. 3. Conclusion needs to be revised by adding the applications where this design can used.</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>1. yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In the last paragraph of Introduction there is word “our design”, in scientific articles or research papers you should not use these words like our, my, I, us etc instead you are required to use general terms. Instead of “our design” you should write “this design”.</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:	Manjot Kaur
Department, University & Country	Punjabi University, India