

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	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes it is important</p> <p>2. The title of the article is very suitable</p> <p>3. Even if the abstract of the manuscript is organized well :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> at the end of the paragraph the authors claimed “D-DEEC protocol outperformed TDEEC in terms of energy consumption, throughputs and the network lifetime.” <p>But how much the proposed protocol outperformed is not stated. Therefore, I recommend the authors to include the numerical or percentile obtained results for the parameters taken for comparison.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract does not mention about WSN. <p>4. The subsections and structures are good but better to write the literature review as one section explicitly.</p> <p>5. Even if it is correct it needs critical proofread, keeping the flow of the idea and grammatical writing issues</p> <p>6. Most of the references are old so that very recent and relevant references should be included</p> <p>Apart from the above observation the following comments needs attention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The word Base Station is used frequently throughout the manuscript and abbreviated as BS but the abbreviation is not stated in Abstract. Even BS and Base stations are used alternatively inside the manuscript. ➤ Generally lack of usage of abbreviations. Like BS, DDEEC, WSN,CH, DEEC and others ➤ Organize the keywords in alphabetical order. ➤ On Equation (2) the symbols you used as “am” are not aligned with description under paragraph (because you did not use equation editor) 	<p>% is now used to show the magnitude of how the new scheme is better than the existing scheme .</p> <p>corrected</p> <p>4. Similar format was used on our first publication in this journal [16]</p> <p>The literature in updated.</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Nodes in the red colour are also advanced nodes. It is now indicated in Fig 1 and in the write up.</p> <p>I tried other equation editor but I am really very comfortable with the equation editor in Ms word. My papers including [16], Ms word was what I have been using. I will try and learn others now.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ On Fig. 1: DEEC protocol the author labelled the normal and advanced nodes by black and green colour. How about the red colour? (not stated)➤ Please use proper equation editor to write your equations.➤ Apart with equation, I strongly recommend to include an algorithm (in steps wise) to show how the proposed algorithm is working➤ Why the energy loss due to signal collision and interference between signals of different nodes are ignored?➤ Avoid the grey background colour of the results figure.➤ Include the complexity comparison between the proposed and TDEEC protocols.	<p>Algorithm of the proposed scheme is now included.</p> <p>The proposed algorithm did not address signal attenuation issues.</p> <p>It is corrected. Tables have been used instead.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article needs further language improvement	Done to best of our ability.
Optional/General comments	The authors should incorporate the comments and suggestions I have forwarded above	done

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	