

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	AsianJournalofResearchinComputerScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJRCOS_112749
TitleoftheManuscript:	DesignandImplementationofanOnlineBloodDonationSystem
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'scomment (ifagreedwithreviewer, correct themanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthe manuscript.Itis mandatorythatauthorsshouldwrite his/herfeedbackhere)
<p>Compulsory REVISIONcomments</p> <p>1. Isthemanuscript important forscientific community? (Please writefewsentenceson thismanuscript)</p> <p>2. Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggest analternativetitle)</p> <p>3. Isthe abstract ofthearticlecomprehensive?</p> <p>4. Aresubsectionsandstructureof themanuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you thinkthemanuscriptisscientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Arethereferences sufficientandrecent?If you have suggestionofadditionalreferences,please mentioninthe review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart fromabove mentioned6 points, reviewersare freetoprovide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- ThepaperDOESNOTadequatelymeetscientificapproaches.</p> <p>a. Thereexistsomeclaimswithouttangibleproofsonobjectivesectionof thepaper.(Likeensuringdatasecurity,awareness,...)Onwhatparticular basisdoesthepapermeasuretheefficacy,datableeaching,...?</p> <p>b. Desiredoutcome“Increasethedonators”hasnotstatisticallyprovenin thepaper.</p> <p>c. Literaturereviewneedstobe revisedPROFOUNDLYintermsofaccurate references(claimswithoutreferences).</p> <p>d. Theliteraturereviewhasnotbeenconductedwiththeaimoffindinga gapamongpreviousstudies.(Lackofcohesionisveryobvious)</p> <p>e. Methodology:SamplingMUSTbegroundedonapreviouslypublished study.</p> <p>f. Pleaseencloseyourquestionnaireor referenceon themethodonwhich theopinionwasextracted.</p> <p>g. Nostatisticalanalysiswascarriedoutoftheobjectivesunderstudy h. Methodology,shouldbe revisedintermsofchallengestheauthor identifiedthroughthe literaturereview.</p> <p>2- Yes</p> <p>3- ThereseearchoutcomesMUSTbeenclosedrelyingondiscussedoutputs.</p> <p>4- Needstobemorecompressed</p> <p>5- Somehow(Needssubstantialrevision)</p> <p>6- Outdated</p> <p>Thisarticleisbettortoreviseintermsof scientificstudythanpracticalcasestudy.</p>	
<p>MinorREVISIONcomments</p> <p>1. Islanguage/Englishquality of the articlesuitableforscholarly communications?</p>	Fine	
<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>	Includelatestresearchendeavoursandlimitthestudyscopewithtangibleclaims,beingableto coveronthisstudy.Literaturereviewmustbethoroughlyrevisedintermsof identifyingaresearch gap.	

[ReviewForm 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:	Saeed Abdolmaleki
Department, University & Country	College of Business, University of Missouri St. Louis, US