

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_105109
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Campus Communication and Collaboration: Design and Development of a Social Community Media Website For Universitas Multimedia Nusantara
Type of the Article	Case study

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.jurnalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

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>	<p>This paper presents the design and development of a social community media website using Rapid Application Development (RAD) at Universitas Multimedia Nusantara (UMN). The study evaluates user satisfaction with the system's user interface, showing high acceptance rates based on perceived usefulness (88.08%) and satisfaction (88.67%) through a conducted survey.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but, it can be improved.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but, it can be improved.</p> <p>1. Aim and Objectives: Be more explicit in stating the specific objectives of the study. Clearly define the metrics or criteria used to evaluate the user interface satisfaction. For instance, mention whether ease of use, navigation, aesthetics, or other factors are being considered.</p> <p>2. Methodology Clarity: Provide more detailed information about the Rapid Application Development (RAD) stages, such as how requirements were gathered, the tools used for design, and specifics about the implementation phase. This will give readers a clearer understanding of your development process.</p> <p>3. Survey Data Presentation: Consider presenting the survey data using tables or charts for both perceived usefulness and satisfaction. This will make it easier for readers to quickly grasp the results and see trends.</p> <p>4. Discussion of Results: In the discussion of the results, provide insights into any notable trends or patterns within the data. For instance, if certain aspects received consistently high or low ratings, discuss possible reasons for this and implications for future improvements.</p> <p>5. Validation of Findings: Briefly discuss how the results of the survey were validated. Did you use any statistical analysis to determine the significance of the responses? If so, provide a sentence or two on the methodology used for validation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Address grammatical errors and improving sentence structure for clarity. Additionally, ensure consistent formatting of figures and tables and refine the presentation of survey results for better readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>None</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Chaitanya Vijaykumar Mahamuni
Department, University & Country	Fr. C Rodrigues Institute of Technology, University of Mumbai, India