

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_124331
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Radio Frequency Visualisation Tool for Wireless Communications
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 title should be more specific by including the primary objectives or outcomes of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be more specific by including the primary objectives or outcomes of the study.	
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.	: Ensure the abstract highlights the significance of your findings and their implications for urban .	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Nice	
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.	Ensure consistency in the use of terms and abbreviations throughout the manuscript. Define all acronyms upon first use. A thorough proofreading for grammatical errors and typographical issues is recommended to ensure the manuscript is polished and professional.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Ensure that all references are current and relevant. Cross-check the citations within the text to make sure they correspond correctly to the reference list.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on the above comments, I believe the manuscript has strong potential but requires some revisions. I recommend minor revisions before it is reconsidered for publication. I look forward to reviewing a revised version that addresses these suggestions. Thank you for your hard work on this important topic. I hope these comments will help you in refining your manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>General comments: The manuscript is well-written and generally clear. However, there are a few sections where technical jargon could be simplified or better explained to make the content accessible to a wider audience. Ensure consistency in the use of terms and abbreviations throughout the manuscript. Define all acronyms upon first use. A thorough proofreading for grammatical errors and typographical issues is recommended to ensure the manuscript is polished and professional.</p> <p>Title: The title should be more specific by including the primary objectives or outcomes of the study.</p> <p>Abstract: Ensure the abstract highlights the significance of your findings and their implications for urban .</p> <p>Introduction: It should more explicitly define the specific gaps in current methods that your research aims to address.</p> <p>Literature review: This section should delineate where existing research falls short and how your approach innovates or improves upon these methodologies.</p> <p>Methodology: Consider including a flowchart or diagram to visually represent the methodology. This can make the process easier to follow. The parameter selection and tuning process should be justified with reasons for the chosen settings and how they were optimized for your specific application.</p> <p>Results and discussion: The narrative should focus more on interpreting these results in the context of EARTH SCINCE in urban environments.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion effectively summarizes the study's contributions, but it should also address the limitations of your research and suggest directions for future work. This will provide a more balanced perspective and demonstrate a thorough understanding of the scope and impact of your research.</p> <p>Reference: Ensure that all references are current and relevant. Cross-check the citations within the text to make sure they correspond correctly to the reference list.</p> <p>General comments: The manuscript is well-written and generally clear. However, there are a few sections where technical jargon could be simplified or better explained to make the content accessible to a wider audience. Ensure consistency in the use of terms and abbreviations throughout the manuscript. Define all acronyms upon first use. A thorough proofreading for grammatical errors and typographical issues is recommended to ensure the manuscript is polished and professional.</p>	

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:	R Murugadoss
Department, University & Country	V.S.B. College of Engineering Technical Campus, India