



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	****) Section introduction. Before going directly to VSP technique, authors should briefly review in a paragraph the state-of-the-art in optimization techniques such as Genetic Optimization for instance. A sentence like this can be like "Many optimization techniques have been proposed in the literature for antenna design such as genetic optimization which it has been useful to design small, multiband, and high-directivity antennas [Ref A-D]" Ref A: Griffiths, L.A., C. Furse and Y.C. Chung, "Broadband and multiband antenna design using the genetic algorithm to create amorphous shapes using ellipses", IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, 2006, Vol. 54, No. 10, p. 2776-2782. Ref B: Herscovici, N., M. Fuentes Osorio, and C. Peixeiro, "Miniaturization of rectangular microstrip patches using genetic algorithms", IEEE Antennas and Wireless Propagation Letters, 2002, vol. 1, p.94-97. Ref C: Jayasinghe, J. W., J. Anguera, and D. N. Uduwawala, "A high-directivity microstrip patch antenna design by using genetic	The author thanks the reviewer for his comments and responds as follows: The Introduction has been modified as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	algorithm optimization," Progress In Electromagnetics Research C, 2013, Vol. 37, p. 131-144. Ref D: J.W. Jayasinghe, J. Anguera , D. N. Uduwawala, "Genetic Algorithm Optimization of a High-Directivity Microstrip Patch Antenna Having a Rectangular Profile", Radioengineering, VOL. 22, NO. 3, SEPTEMBER 2013, pp.700-707 *****) pag.2, The reference "private communication ...:" should be cited as usually , between [] *****) pag. 2Describe VSO *****) pag.2 define SAHC *****) Fig. 2, include dimensions for the antennas and size of the ground plane; indicate the feeding point *****) Figure 3 is unnecessary. Just mention about the code but do not include the code- *****) Figure 4, just keep the plot, do not use the window borders *****) Improve quality of Fig.5 since the bar is not clear *****) Table 2. 3 and 4 should be simplified. It is not needed in a paper to include raw data as that. You should be more concise on the data.	Changed as suggested. The author believes that these suggestions have been addressed in the paper as restructured. With respect to Fig. 2 (Fig. 5 in the revised paper) is a <i>perspective</i> view created by the 4NEC antenna modelling program and consequently cannot be readily annotated with dimensions. In order to provide an indication of size, however, the <i>axis length</i> is recited in the text. The figure caption has been modified to include this information as well. With respect to Fig. 3 (Fig. 6 in the revised paper) the author disagrees with this suggestion. These figures provide the precise antenna dimensions (to four significant digits), and they provide the reader with the ability to "cut and paste" a NEC input file to replicate the published results, which could not be done without the
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	*****) Competing interests. This section is rare in a paper. This should go to the copy right form of the journal but not in the paper. I hope this helps to improve the paper.	data in this figure. The author believes strongly that these data must be included in the paper so that its results are immediately and fully accessible to anyone with a NEC antenna modelling capability. With respect to Figs. 4 and 5 in the original paper, appropriate changes have been made. With respect to Tables 2-4, the author respectfully disagrees. These tables are in the same format and contain the same data as in the relevant published references. And, in any event, include a bit more data than less is useful to readers seeking to replicate the published results. Consequently no changes have been made in these tables. The "competing interests" statement has been removed as the reviewer suggests, but it is important to note that this statement was been included because it is <i>required</i> by the BJAST article template. The author therefore has no objection to its being re-inserted if the Journal's editor considers it essential for publication.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		