

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_117184
Title of the Manuscript:	Automating Item Activation Process by Addressing Challenges and Achieving Error-Free Operations
Type of the Article	

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>)

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript addresses a significant challenge in inventory management and governance, risk, and compliance (GRC) systems, making it relevant to professionals and researchers in these fields.</p> <p>2. The title accurately reflects the content of the article,</p> <p>3. The abstract should be revised to remove the abbreviation and use the full description.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's structure follows a logical flow, with clear subsections delineating the problem statement, methodology, results, and conclusion.</p> <p>5. The scientific correctness of the manuscript appears to be sound, with detailed descriptions of the methodology and results supporting the conclusions drawn.</p> <p>6. Authors should provide more recent references 20 to 25 (of the past five years) to establish a good link to literature.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. minor proofreading may be required to ensure grammatical accuracy and clarity in some sections.</p>	
<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:

Name:	Hicham Gibet Tani
Department, University & Country	Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Morocco