[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	[Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science](#)
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_43749**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Quality of Service Determination in Effurun, Warri Delta State, Nigeria Using Petroleum Training Institute as a Case Study.**
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:

(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract:** The Author tend to us very lengthy sentence in the abstract, making it ambiguous and incoherent. The Author also has poor technical knowledge as such address quality of service (QoS) challenges as a disease. The abstract also fails to tell method adopted in this study and the findings of the study.	
	Introduction: The introduction is very poor and fails to establish a bases for the study. It has a lot of grammatical errors and plagiarised sentences. The author fails also fails to give an outline of how he intend to approach the other part of the work. (Presentations is very important in any article)	
	Literature review: The review has no flow and fails to establish in clear terms the challenges that have existed over time in this area, and how researchers have made progress in ameliorating some of these challenges.	
	The article needs a review of path loss mode as that is the underpinning for this study.	
	Methodology: The author fails to establish in explicit terms the model it is adopting for the evaluation. It fails to provide an analytical relationship between the parameter of investigation (QoS/Loss) and signal reception. It also fails to establish the relationship between the varying transmission frequencies of the Operators and the signal reception and how this translates to loss.	
	Data Presentation: The graphs seems to be blurred and thus difficult to read.	
	Result Discussion and Conclusion: The Author fails to describe the finding as presented in the plots and its corresponding implication with regards to theoretical underpinning. The author fails to give a concise conclusion based on the findings of the study thus making the title of the article not relevant.	
Minor REVISION comments	Keywords should be arranged in alphabetical sequence.	
Optional/General comments	Author needs a good understanding of the bases of signal propagation and spectrum allocation.	
	I suggest the author gets to runs this work on grammatical editors like Grammarly.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Ajibo Augustine Chinenye*
Department, University & Country	*University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria*