

Review of: "Investigations on Input Impedance and Radiation Pattern of a UWB Antenna for Microwave Imaging"

Sudha Malik

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. There are lots of similar studies operating within the same frequency, so I want to see the similarities and differences between this work and similar works. Therefore, the introduction section must be revised accordingly.
2. The presentation of the equations could be enhanced for clarity and accuracy. It is essential that all equations are properly formatted and clearly written to ensure they are easily understandable by the readership. I recommend a thorough review of the equations.
3. The manuscript requires significant revision to address its current shortcomings. Firstly, the text is overly reliant on extensive discussions of other studies, which detracts from the manuscript's original contributions. I recommend condensing these discussions, focusing more on how this work extends or diverges from existing literature, and highlighting the novel aspects of your study more prominently.
4. I have noticed that not all figures are referenced in the text of the manuscript, specifically figures 4, 8, 9, 23, 24, and 26. It is crucial for the coherence and integrity of the manuscript that each figure is discussed or at least mentioned at the relevant points in the text. This ensures that readers understand the context and significance of each figure, contributing to a clearer and more comprehensive presentation of the research findings. I recommend a careful review of the manuscript to ensure that each figure is appropriately cited in the text, thereby enhancing the overall quality and readability of the paper.
5. Return loss plot is not shown in Figure 21, and there is not a discussion about the comparison of simulated and measured results. Please add some text about it.
6. The authors are appreciated for the realization of the sample. However, the frequency spectra of the simulated and measured reflection coefficient in Fig. 24 seem very different. Thus, the authors should justify, if possible, these noticeable discrepancies.
7. I recommend not to refer to the figure in the conclusion.