

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_100841
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPUTER NETWORK OPTIMIZATION USING QUEUE TREE AND PEER CONNECTION QUEUE (PCQ) METHOD AT SMK NEGERI 1 SUMBAWA FOR LEARNING SUPPORT
Type of the 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>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>.It has some significance to the institution for improvement of services.</p> <p>2.Yes.</p> <p>3.Yes. Recommendations to be added and future work. Add 'optimization' to the keywords.</p> <p>4.Yes.</p> <p>5.Yes. The work is scientific in nature. It is a mixed approach research and not qualitative research.</p> <p>6.The references are sufficient. The author(s) should include more details about the publications to make them searchable e.g. [4] and [16] provide no publisher or identifiable data about the publication.</p> <p>7. The results of the interviews and observations are not shared in the results section.</p> <p>8.The problem statement is implied. It is needs to be clearly stated in the introduction section.</p> <p>9.The Suggestion section provides no additional information. It can be removed or changed to Future Work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Editorial work is needed. Incorrect punctuation. Wrong tenses used.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oluwaseyitanfunmi Osunade
Department, University & Country	University of Ibadan, Nigeria