

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_121101
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Implementation of Online Crime Report System Using Rapid Application Development (RAD) Methodology
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A scientific community consists of scientists working in a particular field of science and, most importantly, of their relationships and interactions	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some of the section part has no subsection in the paper. More number of results are to be gathered. Comparison of results are missing with the existing methods.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically not correct because the manuscript does not looks like article. It looks like a general article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References present in the article are sufficient but it has to be chronological order. Citations are missing in the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	M Pradeep
Department, University & Country	Shri Vishnu Engineering College for Women, India