

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128823
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Performance of Evolve Radio Access Bearer Channel Drop Rate for 4G Networks Across Nigeria
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The manuscript contributes to the scientific community by offering a data-driven evaluation of mobile network performance using real data .</p> <p>This evaluation highlights key trends, strengths, and areas for improvement for the four mobile network operators studied. It a good contribution to knowledge in terms on understanding the drop the channel drop rates for 4G technology.</p> <p>The findings provide valuable insights into 4G mobile network performance and reliability, supporting efforts to enhance user experience, industry best practices, and informing policy and decision-making in telecommunications.</p> <p>Therefore, the manuscript provides a sufficient context for the study and has visible contribution to the scientific community.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article is relevant to this study. However, the title could be made more specific to mobile network operators, for example: Comparative Performance of Evolve Radio Access Bearer Channel Drop Rate for 4G Technlogy Across Four Major Mobile Network Operators in Nigeria	
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.	The abstract is thorough and effectively guides the reader through the synthesis of the paper. It addresses key components, including a clear presentation of the problem, the aim, identified gaps, related works, methodology, analysis, findings, and recommendations.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically accurate. However, there are certain concepts that require further clarification to ensure readers can understand the article without difficulty. The reviewer has identified the following points that may need the author's attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kindly provide an explanation for the concepts D-NGN, A-NGN, B-NGN, and C-NGN. - Clarify the indicators RSSI, RSRQ, RSRP, and SINR, as they are mentioned in the manuscript as acronyms. - In Figures 4 to 6, the term 'BM' is introduced under the legend. Does this refer to a benchmark? Please ensure this is clearly stated upfront before providing the results from these figures. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, please ensure consistency in referencing, as some authors are highlighted in bold while others are not. However, all in-text citations are correctly included in the reference list.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper adheres to academic standards in terms of structure, context, scientifically rigor, and clarity.	

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:	Khanyisani Khayelihle Xulu
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, South Africa