

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_100098
Title of the Manuscript:	The development and deployment of an online exam system: A web application
Type of the Article	Method 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. In this paper, the authors present a proposal for a system for applying online knowledge tests, called the Online Exam System (OES). The proposal is interesting. However, some corrections can contribute to the paper in its final form.</p> <p>a- I should cite the references using brackets [];</p> <p>b- I suggest transferring figures 3 and 4 to an appendix section, and including a flowchart or block diagram in place of these figures;</p> <p>c- It is important to include in the conclusions the advantage of the proposed system in relation to commercial systems already available. It is also important to include an advantage from the pedagogical point of use of the methodology proposed in the conclusions.</p> <p>2. Yes!</p> <p>3. Yes!</p> <p>4. Yes!</p> <p>5. Yes!</p> <p>6. Yes!</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angelo Marcelo Tuset
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Brazil