

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	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. Below are my suggestions. - 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. - In an introduction, the author(s) should discuss more about what problems need to be solved. What are the major problems/main contributions? - Fig.1-3 is not clear the results of the performance. - the detail in Table 1- 3: is not show the performance of through parameter estimation. - 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. - The part of references, you should show the more references in this article.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santi Pattanavichai
Department, University & Country	Rajamangala University of Technology, Thailand