

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofResearchinComputerScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJRCOS_130770
TitleoftheManuscript:	ASurveyonBinaryTree-BasedApproachesforDataTransmissioninMobileAdHocNetworks
TypeoftheArticle	

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer’scomment	Author’sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
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.	In this manuscript, binary tree-based methods for data transmission in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks (MANETs) are thoroughly reviewed. Significant issues in the discipline are addressed by its emphasis on enhancing dynamic networks' latency, scalability, and energy efficiency. A modern relevance is added by integrating blockchain and machine learning as future considerations, which is consistent with continuous technological improvements. These insights can help researchers and practitioners improve MANET protocols and put dependable, scalable systems into practice.	Thanks Reviewer
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	The existing title, "A Survey on Binary Tree-Based Approaches for Data Transmission in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks," is suitable and adequately conveys the content. However, a more succinct alternative could be: "Binary Tree-Based Data Transmission Techniques in MANETs: A Comprehensive Survey."	Ok
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 is generally detailed, outlining the paper's important points such as aims, obstacles, and potential solutions. However, it may benefit from a more explicit statement of the specific methodology examined, as well as an emphasis on the findings' practical applicability. Consider deleting unnecessary terms to improve clarity and readability.	Ok
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The work appears to be scientifically correct, with a clear evolution of ideas supported by relevant material. It clearly covers the benefits and drawbacks of binary tree-based techniques, while certain portions may benefit from further quantitative analysis or simulation data to bolster the claims.	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 adequate and relevant, addressing recent advances in the subject. However, including more articles from the last two years that focus on AI-driven optimization and blockchain integration in MANETs will boost the review's currency and relevancy.	Thanks Reviewer
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. Some sentences in the abstract and introduction may be rewritten to improve conciseness and flow. For instance, swapping "The synergy of binary tree structures with routing & data aggregation results to enhanced energy efficiency" for "The integration of binary tree structures with routing and data aggregation enhances energy efficiency" increases understanding.	I fixed it
Optional/General comments		

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>	