

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_124341
Title of the Manuscript:	Protecting Autonomous UAVs from GPS Spoofing and Jamming: A comparative analysis of detection and mitigation techniques
Type of the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
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 article is of relevance with the growing use of drones both in the military and the civil domain. A study of how jamming and spoofing can ensure ways and means to protect them and ensure accurate use.	
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.	No. The research has 3 questions raised by the author. However, they do not find mention in the abstract. They need to be discussed with reduced discussion on the finding.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. The paper is not clear in the way it is presented. The author raises three research questions but suddenly one finds a model being discussed. The results that emerge also happen out of nowhere and so the data related to the results is also found to be missing. Need to be provided for	
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.	Cannot ascertain the same till the paper is made clearer.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Language is acceptable but the presentation is not.	
Optional/General comments	Needs a Major Revise to be clearer and acceptable for publication.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nitin Agarwala
Department, University & Country	India