

Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JERR_86970   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Characterization of monostatic radar system for accuracy improvement through parameter estimation |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

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)            |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>Paper presentations lacking new ideas, just the way of through parameter estimation. This research has turned out some interesting findings; I cannot support publication of this paper.</p> <p>Below are my suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In an abstract, the author(s) should discuss more the performance of result in this research and more detail about the tools for monostatic radar system.</li><li>- In an introduction, the author(s) should discuss more about what problems need to be solved. What are the major problems/main contributions?</li><li>- Fig.1-3 is not clear the results of the performance.</li><li>- the detail in Table 1- 3: is not show the performance of through parameter estimation.</li><li>- The last section (Concluding Remarks) is unsatisfactory yet. In this section I would like to see a detailed and extensive discussion about the findings, about how these findings may be interpreted, about the shortcomings of the studies, and about future research.</li><li>- The part of references, you should show the more references in this article.</li></ul> | <p>The key areas highlighted by the reviewer has been structured to fit in to the reviewer’s suggestions and thereby, coloured yellow.</p> <p><b>This is original research paper</b></p> |
| Minor REVISION comments      |  |  |
| Optional/General comments    |  |  |

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) | Corrected   |