

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	Original Research 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://r1reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1reviewerhub.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.	The paper focuses on a critical topic—ERAB drop rates in 4G LTE networks within Nigeria. This findings provide meaningful insights into network performance and regulatory compliance, benefiting operators, regulators, and end-users.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is Suitable	
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 well-written and covers the key aspects of the study, but still there can be improvement to enhance its comprehensiveness and clarity. Include a clear statement about the purpose of the study to establish its relevance upfront. Highlight how this study contributes to the field or differs from existing research	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, but some aspects require further clarification and refinement to ensure its scientific accuracy and robustness. Add a detailed methodology section describing the data processing and analysis steps Include statistical validation measures to strengthen the reliability of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few cited references ([3], [4], [23]) discuss methodologies similar to those used in this study. Still highlighting comparisons with these prior works could better establish the originality of the study's approach. References can also be in chronological order	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. Also a thorough review for grammatical and formatting consistency is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly articulate the study's unique contributions compared to prior research. Provide additional methodological details and address potential limitations of the dataset or analysis. Expand the discussion to explore the root causes of performance disparities and their broader implications. Revise the figures and captions to ensure they effectively convey the study's key insights 	

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 Detail

Name:	S.Uma
Department, University & Country	Government Arts and Science College - Tirupattur