

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRCOS_129075 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Autocheck: Inspection Service Application, Purchase Assistance, And Used Car Buying And Selling |
| Type of the 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>

PART 1: 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 feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | | |
| 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. | | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The paper "Autocheck: Inspection Service Application, Purchase Assistance, And Used Car Buying And Selling" provides a fairly comprehensive overview of the idea and research results, but it needs to improve in terms of detail and focus more on the practical issues the application aims to solve.</p> <p>1. ABSTRACT: Although the abstract mentions the functions of AutoCheck, it does not clarify the key differences or advantages of the application over existing solutions. Some sentences are a bit long, which may cause confusion for the reader. It is also unclear who the primary target audience for the application is.</p> <p>2. INTRODUCTION: Although trends and studies are mentioned, this section does not provide statistics or specific examples for illustration. The introduction repeatedly emphasizes the importance of used car inspections without adding new details, leading to redundancy. It does not explain why current technologies (such as traditional car inspection services) are insufficient or</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>do not meet market needs.</p> <p>3. RESEARCH METHODS: Although related studies are listed, this section does not clearly explain how those studies impact or differ from the AutoCheck application. It does not clarify how AutoCheck improves or addresses the limitations of systems mentioned in previous studies. Some information from prior research is not directly relevant to the application (e.g., details about data storage or managing OEM products).</p> <p>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: While this section mentions the development and testing of the application, it does not provide experimental data or performance metrics to measure the application's effectiveness. Input, processing, and output requirements are described very generally in Table 1, without specifying the level of detail or the specific cases the application needs to handle. More realistic use cases should be clarified, and specific requirements should be listed (e.g., required input fields, maximum data quantities the system can handle). The hardware and software requirements do not clearly explain why such configurations are necessary. For example, why is 16GB of RAM or 1TB SSD needed when the application appears lightweight? More specific justifications for resource needs (RAM, storage) based on data load calculations or expected user numbers could be added. The context diagram and ERD lack detailed relationships and logic in the actual process. Although black-box testing shows that the main functions work well, it does not provide details on testing scenarios or the system's limitations.</p> <p>5. CONCLUSION AND DEVELOPMENT SUGGESTIONS: The conclusion focuses mainly on what the current application can do, but the development suggestions are too general and lack concrete details. A more specific development plan is needed (e.g., what data AI features require, how insurance integration works) so the reader can better understand the roadmap and feasibility.</p> <p>Conclusion: Does not meet expectations.</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) |
|--|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Nguyen Thi Hang |
| Department, University & Country | Thai Nguyen University, University of Information and Communications Technology, Vietnam |