

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_130460
Title of the Manuscript:	Routing Algorithms: A Comprehensive Review of Classification and Security Issues in MANET
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of routing algorithms in MANETs, which are crucial for ensuring efficient data communication in dynamic network environments. By analyzing proactive, reactive, and hybrid algorithms and highlighting their strengths, weaknesses, and security implications, the paper significantly contributes to understanding MANET routing. This review also emphasizes the need for secure and energy-efficient protocols, a critical aspect for modern applications like disaster recovery and military operations.	Thanks reviewer
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly conveys the manuscript's focus on routing algorithms and their classification and security issues in MANETs. No changes are recommended.	Thanks reviewer
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.	The abstract provides a high-level overview of the manuscript, emphasizing the focus on hybrid routing algorithms and their applications. However, it could include specific findings or quantitative insights to make it more comprehensive. Suggested addition: "The review highlights the scalability of hybrid algorithms like ZRP and their ability to combine proactive and reactive features effectively."	Thanks reviewer
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate and presents a robust analysis of routing algorithms. The classification, comparison tables, and detailed explanation of various protocols are technically sound and well-supported by references.	Thanks reviewer
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. However, incorporating more papers from the last two years could enhance the manuscript's relevance. Suggested addition: Add recent works on AI-driven routing protocols for MANETs (e.g., [37], [43]).	Thank you for your attention to this matter, I add other reference ,[45],[46],[47]
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical improvements can enhance readability, such as: "Such DSDV, the WRP..." can be revised to "Similar to DSDV, the WRP..." "Multipath, which transmits messages..." can be revised for clarity.	Thanks reviewer
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript could benefit from a graphical representation of routing protocol comparisons for a better visual understanding.</p> <p>More emphasis on the practical challenges in implementing hybrid protocols in real-world MANET scenarios could improve its applicability.</p>	Thank you for your attention to this matter, I did it

Review Form 3

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