

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_122132
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARITIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SIGNAL STRENGTH OF TWO RADIO STATIONS IN OKENE, KOGI STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**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)
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript contains important information on the comparative analysis of signals. The result are expected . It is common sense to estimate he effect of path loss, however, the authors have made efforts to define the he minimum range required for the installation of booster stations.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes	
<b>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.</b>	Yes	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<b>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.</b>	The scientific robustness of the manuscript is fair.,	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Nope, more references are needed especially in the introduction section <a href="https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/3052241">https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/3052241</a>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Fair enough	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The graphs should be plotted with more specialized soft ware such as Origin pro</li> <li>2. The discussion should be expanded based on experimental results with values</li> <li>3. The resolution of Fig. 2 should be improved</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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:	Alexander I. Ikeuba
Department, University & Country	University of Calabar, Nigeria