



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_31575
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF CONGESTION OF MOBILE NETWORK IN OFFA
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>This study present a proposal of analysis of congestion of mobile network in OFFA, Kware State of Nigeria. I would like to recommend the following suggestion to the author:</p> <p>1 – This study is very important and necessary. As related by the author, and, according the possibility of performance of this study in the context of OFFA, the analysis trough the data collection is an appropriated tool. However, I would like to list some suggestion for improvement the research and recommend to the author to make an analysis about these points:</p> <p>I can understand that the condition of there are no enough base stations, End-to-End system, network channels, etc..are the main responsible for technical problems that results in the network congestions. However, the same study shows the increase of the number of subscribes per network. In this context, how it work the mobile network, is probabilistic or deterministic? Who is responsible for meet the demand? How it works the mobile network, is private? I believe that these questions may show new factors that influence in the services and strategy of coverage area.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1 – The topics presented in the paper is a litle</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>confused, mainly for the reader. I suggest to the author, revise the topics "Objectives of the study (line 258)", "Significate of the study (line314)" and "Scope of study (line334)" to make only one paragraph, and, include this new paragraph after the topic of "Introduction".</p> <p>2 – I believe the some definitions is not necessary to be presented in the paper, such as presented in the line 339 "Definition of Terms", if this definition is referenced on the paper, I believe is enough!</p> <p>3 – The terms "SA", "A", "SD", "D" and "U" used in the table 2 (line 394) must be explained!</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Hermes José Loschi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>States University the Campinas, Brazil</i>