

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	Review Paper

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 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.	Topic is relevant	
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.	Abstract is not well structure. It is not defining the structure and methodologies used in the paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, Numbering and labelling are missing	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive mixed-methods approach.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are minor grammar issues throughout the document. For example, in the introduction: "However this reliance increases UAVs' vulnerability..." should be "However, this reliance increases UAVs' vulnerability..."	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Justification is required throughout the entire paper. 2. In Table 2: Ferreira et al. [71] is coming twice in the table presenting different key matrices. 3. One of the most important functions of a literature review is identifying gaps. Although you have discussed the shortcomings in current systems, there is no explicit statement of the remaining gaps in the field that your research aims to fill. 4. The paper failed to explain which platform or software was used for the implementation. 5. The paper failed to provide a detailed description of the results. 6. Data tables are missing for Figures 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Including the corresponding data tables for these figures is essential to allow for a clearer understanding and validation of the results presented. These tables will provide the numerical data behind the visual representations, enhancing transparency and reproducibility. 7. Citations are missing for Figure 1 and Figure 2. It is important to provide appropriate references for the data or sources used in these figures to ensure proper attribution and enhance the credibility of the visual representations. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Syed Mohd Faisal
Department, University & Country	Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, India