

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_123360
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Handoff drop call rate In GSM network In Delta State with dynamic cut off channel allocation scheme
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Specific Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The abstract summarizes the work well, but it would benefit from clearer articulation of the specific problem being addressed. The phrase "new hybrid handoff dynamic cut-off algorithm was developed" needs further clarity. What specific shortcomings of existing algorithms does this new algorithm address? Briefly mention the performance improvements in more precise terms (e.g., stating a percentage improvement in drop calls). 2. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The introduction provides a solid background, but the flow of information can be improved. The transition between explaining the problem (drop call rates) and introducing the solution (new hybrid algorithm) is abrupt. Consider adding a section that discusses the limitations of current handoff algorithms in more detail to create a smoother transition. 3. Literature Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The literature review covers relevant studies, but it lacks depth in critical analysis. Rather than just summarizing prior works, the review should critically assess their limitations and how the proposed research aims to overcome these gaps. For example, the work of Tekinay and Jabbari (2021) is cited, but their limitations regarding call admission control (CAC) could be more explicitly linked to the development of the new algorithm in this study. 4. Methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The methodology is well-structured, but some technical aspects require more detail. For instance, the section on data collection from the Operation and Maintenance Centre (OMC) should clarify how the data was validated. Were there any discrepancies in the data that could affect the outcome of the simulations? 5. Results and Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The results section is comprehensive but lacks sufficient interpretation in some areas. For example, in Table 3 (Simulation Results), the significance of each metric (HFR, HDP, DCP) should be more thoroughly explained. What do the improvements in these metrics imply for real-world network performance? o The discussion should also compare the simulated results with real-world data from other regions, not just the NCC benchmarks. This would provide a broader perspective on the effectiveness of the new algorithm. <p>Additional Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript would benefit from a thorough language and grammar review to improve readability. • Figures and tables are informative, but some could be better labeled and accompanied by more detailed captions. 	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anand Prakash Srivastava
Department, University & Country	NITRA Technical Campus, India