

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_109194
Title of the Manuscript:	Elevating Customer Experience: An Empirical Study on Computer Chair Selection in Furniture Retail
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Research makes important contributions to the scientific community, particularly in the fields of decision support systems, human-computer interaction, and ergonomics. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It focuses on developing a practical decision support system to aid in computer chair selection, which can benefit end users who struggle to choose an ergonomic chair. This is an application of technology that can have tangible impacts on people's health and productivity 2. It utilizes and evaluates a specific decision-making technique (simple additive weighting) for this purpose. Examining the effectiveness of decision methodologies for real-world recommendation systems provides useful insights. 3. The research is framed in the context of wider trends like increasing computer use and the importance of ergonomics. It makes a case for the value of the system to support this need. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Some minor improvements could be to reorder the phrases more logically as "Development of a Decision Support System for Selecting Computer Chairs Using the Simple Additive Weighting Method" 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The level of detail is appropriate for an abstract, providing a cohesive overview of the key background, aims, methods, results, and conclusions. Sufficient information is included to give readers an understanding of the work and its contributions. <p style="text-align: center;">Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem identification and motivation follow logical reasoning around the growth of computing and importance of ergonomics. Establishing this rationale is scientifically valid. • Technically appropriate tools are utilized including data flow diagrams, flowcharts, and simple additive weighting calculations. This demonstrates scientifically competent implementation. • The overall research methodology adheres to standard practices in applied information systems research, progressing from analysis to design, development, testing, and evaluation. <p style="text-align: center;">Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>16 references are included overall, which seems appropriate for an abstract. These cover background literature and methods.</p> <p>Potential improvements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Citing more literature specifically on computer chair ergonomics and recommendation systems, if available, to further establish the gap addressed. - Including sources for any data/statistics presented on computer use and ergonomic issues. - Additional references on the simple additive weighting method if any nuances were leveraged. 	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system development outcomes are presented through sample interface screenshots showing the main functions – administrator item input, user criteria selection, and recommendation output. These help illustrate the final product. - Quantitative metrics are provided for the system testing, including the 80.47% user satisfaction score. The questionnaire data table gives some insights into the user responses. - Text descriptions summarize the testing procedure and results. The SAW calculations matched manual examples, indicating accuracy. - The concluding remarks highlight the overall ability to effectively develop the system using SAW, and adequately meet the research aims. - Limitations around the criteria weighting approach are acknowledged in comparison to previous studies. 	
<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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Utkarsh Mittal</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Stanford University, USA</p>