

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.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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ The manuscript is somehow important to scientific community. √ The title is okay √ The abstract – the problem being solved is missing. √ The parts of the manuscript is mixed up, which makes hard to follow. √ The main reasons of the research are mentioned at the end of the introduction, I propose that they come immediately after the problem statement for logic flow. √ The results are discussed too early (in introduction part), which should be discussed in part 3 of the manuscript. √ "Screenshots of the interface design presentation of the Sircle website system are depicted in Figures 1 to Figure 2..." The statement is incorrect, since we already have Figure 1 as the flowchart. √ The captioning of figures is not standard, some are with period, some are missing, e.g., Figure 2 √ In-text citation of Tables is incorrect, for example, Table .1, Table .2. √ Tables 3 and 4 are referenced but they are not there √ Some references are too old like Ref. 16 and 17 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English is Ok	
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:	Douglas Nyabuga
Department, University & Country	Mount Kenya University, Rwanda