



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6757
Title of the Manuscript:	Dipole-Loaded Monopole Optimized Using VSO
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction needs improvement. More literature survey should be included, specifying the advantages and disadvantages of the existing approaches. It should be mentioned how the proposed VSO method is superior to other available methods. What is done in paper, and how significant is the author's contribution? In Section 2, author has abruptly started explaining VSO-optimized loaded monopole. First VSO should be explained, then the geometry considered followed by the optimization. The sequence of the sections needs modification in order to make the flow of the paper proper. Author has compared various optimization methods. They should be mentioned in Introduction or some other place together. If reader finds suddenly one new method in text, the confusion occurs. Only radiation pattern is compared as the performance of antenna considered. It would be better if some other parameters like impedance, return loss etc can be included as the output results for optimized antenna structure.	The author thanks the reviewer for his helpful comments, and responds as follows: The Introduction has been improved as suggested with additional references added to the bibliography. The paper has been reorganized as suggested. Text has been added to the introduction as suggested. Addressed. The author respectfully disagrees with this comment. The VSO paper solves the same problem posed by Altshuler, nothing more, nothing less, for the purpose of demonstrating that VSO performs better than Altshuler's GA. The VSO results as described are head-to-head with Altshuler's for the purpose of comparison.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Altshuler <i>did not</i> include impedance, return loss, or any other parameter in his performance evaluation (copy of his paper attached). It therefore is <i>inappropriate</i> to do so with VSO, because then the comparison to Altshuler's results is no longer valid. Nevertheless, the VSO paper as written indeed does provide calculated impedance data in the last paragraph of Section 2.2 (revised version) as parenthetical data in the original and revised versions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The figure captions need to be relooked. Is it proper to write VSO(a), GA(b), and SAHC(c)...? Include reference against v-PSO in manuscript.	The author has no objection to changing the figure numbering as suggested, but does point out that this is a fair amount of possibly unnecessary bookkeeping. The author believes that this is an editorial decision that should be made by the journal's editorial staff, and will willingly comply if such a change is required. The v-PSO reference in Section 2.3 has been clarified as suggested.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The comparison between the approaches like VSO, PSO, v-PSO etc should be summarized at the end before conclusion.	This comparison appears in paragraphs 2-6, inclusive, in Section 2.3.