



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_48578</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cramer-Rao bound of Direction Finding Using Uniform Arc Arrays</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I reviewed the article; however, without checking all the equations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The abstract reads like an introduction. The way the abstract is written, a bunch of references would be needed. I notice that there are some elements of the abstract in the introduction. So, please write an appropriate abstract.</li> <li>(2) The conclusions appear to be a repeat of the abstract, so please write an appropriate conclusion.</li> <li>(3) And perhaps regarding most important aspect of the work of "direction finding:" Your Figures 1 and 2 indicate an incoming plane wave. Well, a plane wave is extended without boundaries. Consequently, for your work, there should be some localization for appropriate detection, viz. spherical wave.</li> </ol> <p>So, I would only recommend publication with (1), (2), and (3) re-solved</p>	<p>Thank you for these valuable comments. Sorry for such mix-up of information. In response,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An appropriate abstract has now been written.</li> <li>2. An appropriate conclusion has now been written.</li> <li>3. Spherical wave is worth to be considered. Thank you for bringing this out. However, this investigation was restricted to plane waves. Please see the second last sentence above Figure 1. To avoid diversion from the present focus of the investigation, it is our humble view to not consider the spherical wave.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Please consider references to Radon transforms.	Thank you for this suggestion. However, our manuscript has no mention of Radon transforms and we respectfully wish not to introduce the Radon transforms.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Again, abstract, introduction, conclusions should be distinctly different, and there needs to be discussion about the use of spherical waves.	Thank you for this very valuable comment. The abstract and conclusion have now been revised. To avoid diversion from the present focus of the investigation, it is our humble view to not consider spherical waves.

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	