Review of: "Generative Artificial Intelligence Using Machine Learning on Wireless Ad Hoc Networks"

Evilasio Costa Junior[1]

1 Universidade Federal do Ceará

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper presents a new strategy for using generative artificial neural networks to evaluate, select metrics, and improve ad hoc wireless networks.

The paper's topic is interesting, the article is clearly written, and the proposed contribution is relevant. The methodology is presented satisfactorily, and the strategy is evaluated through an experiment.

However, several points could be improved.

- In the abstract, the authors state that the paper will discuss the use of generative AI to improve the performance of ad hoc wireless networks. However, much of this discussion is concentrated in the introduction and a small section of related works. It is not sufficient to address this as one of the first contributions of the paper in its abstract. I suggest the authors adjust the abstract to clarify the paper's contributions or expand this discussion within the text.

- Regarding the contributions, the authors inform in the introduction that one of the main contributions is a model of a framework. However, they do not mention this framework at any other point in the text. The authors present a model for extracting, selecting, and analyzing metrics based on their architecture but not a framework. I suggest that this contribution presented in the introduction be reviewed.

- I should have included comparing the work presented with the other related works. In what way does the authors' work differ from the others, in the authors' opinion?

- It would be interesting if the authors explored how the SPSS 25 tool works and how it was used, since it is widely used in the work, or so it seems.

- I would like Figures 3 and 6 to be more detailed because the way they are presented does not seem to add much to the explanation.

- Why were 13 metrics selected and not 14? Which metric was not selected? Could you also explain in more detail why these metrics were chosen? Is there one or more works that recommend using these metrics in the evaluated scenarios?

- In the results presented in Tables 4 to 7, it would be interesting to also talk about the values that were not so positive to understand better the nuances and results of each scenario of the experiment, or at least scenario 1, which proved to be more qualified after the discussion presented in section 5.

- Graphs 9 and 10 show the observed importance of each metric. How can these results assist in modeling, topology, or network performance analysis? Explore this further in the discussion.

- In section 4 of the experiment, I missed the discussion of threats to validity.

Finally, note that the study has a lot of potential and scientific relevance, but needs some adjustments.