

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_110800
Title of the Manuscript:	Distance-Distributed Energy Efficient Clustering (D-DEEC) routing protocol for wireless sensor network
Type of the Article	

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	  1-This work addresses the problem of energy efficiency of sensor nodes and network lifetime, which is the major problem in WSNs, by proposing a solution based on the distance between the nodes and the base station which represents an important factor when designing such a network. Therefore, this work seems important for scientific community. 2- The title is the name of the solution and it is clear. It is suitable. 3- The abstract is well detailed, with the problem presentation in the beginning and the shortcomings, the proposed solution and its advantages at the end. 4- The subsections and structure are clear. However, I propose adding a stateof the art section to detail old work and why not make a comparative table, which represents the advantages and disadvantages of each. The author only details the work from DEEC, but other works must be proposed, that uses distance as a CH selection criterion. 5- Yes, I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6- The references are not very recent and not sufficient, but as I already mentioned in (4-), it is better to add other works which are of geographical routing protocol which take into consideration the distance as a selection criterion.	          4. Tables for comparison are inserted  The literature review is updated to include research work with distance as factors in selecting the cluster heads. However, distance between the CHs and their neighbours is not very common in the literature.  The reference is updated.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	  1- Take the help of someone specialized in English to correct the different parts.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	  ** I see that it is necessary to add a state of the art section to list the various recent works and even to break down this section according to the types of protocols. In addition, putting a comparative table at the end like that will make the work enriching. ** The author compared his solution with a single protocol (TDEEC); I propose to add another protocol to clearly highlight the performance of his proposal.	  Recent papers with distance as a factor are not very common or easy to obtained if it exists. However, I have added some research papers on that.  Sometimes it takes time to develop codes to run an existing scheme. This will be noted in subsequent publications.

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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