

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125760
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis and Prediction of Path Loss for Mobile Communication Lines in Nasarawa State Using Propagation Models
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript does not justify why it is taking only Nasarawa State. Manuscript also failed to justify the consideration of 4G only while 5G is already launched and 6G is in testing. I dislike this manuscript because the methodology is not clear and data has been collected from non-authentic sources.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Please add some details as, to why only Nasarawa State is selected for the study	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In the result section loss in cable has been mentioned. It is not clear how loss in cable has been measured. The methodology section must be improved.	
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.	According to the manuscript, Various applications have been used to get network information which is not scientific method of data collection. For cell information google map has been used which is again not authentic information source.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Number of references are sufficient but most of them are old. So I suggest to add some new references published in last 3 years.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	No, Words like material are suitable in this case.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Alok Srivastava</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chadrawati Group of Institution, India</b>