Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_79755
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Fade Margin in Telecommunication Network in Auchi, Nigeria
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:

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		, and the second
Minor REVISION comments		
The state of the s	This paper investigates the fade margin in a particular mobile network in Nigeria. In	
	consideration of the parameters of latitude, height of tower, power, antenna gain and	
	model, frequency, path length and distance, the fade margins of three different links	
	were derived in detail. The mobile network fade margins across the three different links	
	were within the acceptable range of 10db to 30db. It was discovered that the longer the	
	path length, the higher the fade margin value, and was confirmed in the results.	
	1) The value of Net Path Loss in Table 3.1-3.2 is very large, it should be explained.	
	2) The derived conditions of equation (3.4) and (3.5) should be explained, and the	
	D_{HOR} = distance in kilometers to the RF horizon did not appear in the equation.	
	3) In Page No.10, for $d < d_c$ and for $d \ge d_c$, the Equation No. should be given.	
	4) The first link, the distance between antennas is 3.06 kilometres, this distance is	
	larger than $d_{ m c}$, so the L_{PATH} should use equation (3.7) to calculate. And the received	
	signal level calculation in chapter 3.3.3, the L_{PATH} should be $40.15dB$.	
	5) The paper should be checked carefully and should be simplified.	
Out in all Our and I was a second		
Optional/General comments		

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yifeng He
Department, University & Country	China Academy of Space Technology, China

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)