

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_93329
Title of the Manuscript:	Using 3D Tools to Design CCTV Monitoring System for Ghanaian University: A case of C.K. Tadam University of Technology and Applied Sciences (CKT-UTAS)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a diagram so that section 2.4's challenging concept can be easily comprehended. • In an abstract, the research-related institutions are referred to as public universities, while the other sections, universities are referred to as autonomous universities. It eliminates the inconsistency from the paper. • Each sentence contains grammatical, symantic and spelling errors that need to be fixed. I have attempted to highlight them with yellow marks. But every sentence contains grammatical and syntax faults. • Put the research paper's structure at the end of the introduction section. • The full form of FOV is provided in the second sentence in the paragraph below Figure 5 after usage. Put things right. • In some places Figure x is kept and at some places Fig. x is kept. All of these factors negatively impact the research paper's quality. It's crucial to fix them. It is challenging to identify all of the errors like this one. Finding and fixing each of these problems is crucial. • Some terms have their first letter capitalised, which I don't think is necessary. Locate them, then fix them. • The research article is not consistent with the conclusion and recommendation. According to the research paper, format it. • As the value derived from the result section, write abstract. • Explain the correlation between the data gathered from the observers in the findings section using descriptive analysis. • There must be a full reinterpretation, and some claims must be expressed in clear terms rather than ambiguous ones. Please update the spelling if it appears to be incorrect. • Sentences that don't fit the research have been used in a few paragraphs. Remove these and replace them with research-related sentences. Keep the paragraphs in order so that the reader can make adjustments because the order is disorganised as well. • Use a variety of graphics to support your studied data in the results section. • Could you please clarify how the study's objectives were chosen? • It is important to introduce more investigation and adequate discussion of the findings. • The long-term strategy could be addressed. • A summary of how the work advances the area from the current level of knowledge should have been included in the conclusion. In the conclusion section, the author should clearly justify the effort and, if relevant, mention any uses or extensions. • When discussing the implications that may be made from this research work, for instance, there is no coherence between the abstract and the article's substance. • The outcome need to have been assessed and carefully contrasted with others. For a comparative comparison of various entities, use bar or pie graphs. The components of this investigation are the several research parameters that were chosen. • The introduction is supposed to introduce the problem to be solved in this article. Are there any existing solutions? Which is the best? What is its main limitations? What does the author hope to achieve? Properly address them in the introduction. • The result should have been evaluated and thoroughly compared with others. Use bar or pie graphs for comparative analysis of different entities. The selected different parameters for research are entities of this research. • There is no coherence between the abstract and the content of the article, for example, addressing the conclusions that can be drawn from this research work. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shyam R. Sihare
Department, University & Country	Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Government College, India