

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3687
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing Routing Protocols for Mobile Ad-Hoc Networks in NS2: INTSM, AODV, and DSDV under Node Density Variations
Type of the Article	BOOK CHAPTER

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript, while detailed, could benefit from clearer differentiation of the advantages and limitations of INTSM compared to existing protocols like AODV and DSDV. It relies heavily on NS2 simulations, which, while useful, may not fully represent the complexities of real-world MANET deployments. The literature review, though extensive, could integrate more recent works to provide a broader perspective on advancements in MANET routing protocols. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The title of the article could be more specific to reflect the focus on node density variations and the detailed comparison of routing protocols. 	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is comprehensive, but it can be slightly refined for clarity and conciseness. Highlight the specific advantage of INTSM compared to AODV and DSDV to make the abstract more compelling. Briefly mention any key findings or insights from the simulations 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript's structure is appropriate but could benefit from merging overlapping sections like "Routing Protocols" and "Literature Survey". The performance metrics and better alignment of figures with text would also improve readability. 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically strong, using NS2 simulations to test routing protocols in MANETs and introducing the new INTSM for load balancing. Comparing it with well-known protocols makes the study reliable and provides useful insights into network performance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though some sentences can be simplified for clarity. Minor grammatical corrections and avoiding redundancy would improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is technically strong but could benefit from clearer sentence structure, merging similar sections. Figures should be referenced and the comparison of INTSM with existing protocols could be expanded. Minor language and grammatical improvements would enhance readability.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. Viji Gripsy
Department, University & Country	Institute of Computer Science and Information Science, Srinivas University, India