

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>The manuscript is very basic text on current developments. There was a single mention of using smart automation to overcome some problems, which are not clearly mentioned in the paper. The authors need to add some more value to this paper to be scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>The deployment part is missing in the paper, hence the title should be "The Development of an Online Exam System: A Web Application"</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The subsection comparing the subject matter with existing online exam systems is missing.</p> <p>Some improvements required in the section 3 are highlighted.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>However, the references are not mapped correctly or out of scope of the system under study. These have been marked in the draft manuscript during review</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some sentences are vague with references to articles as "It", "This", "They" etc.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper need to be restructured and recreated. The results and conclusion section is missing a lot of things.</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:	Nikhil Tanaji More
Department, University & Country	India