

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_86884
Title of the Manuscript:	Design a Real-Time Communication System using 3CX Software-Based Private Branch Exchange Phone System on Raspberry Pi Device
Type of the Article	Method 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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paper title: It contains some acronyms (such as 3CX and Pi which makes it unclear. - English Writing: This article requires moderate proofreading. The authors should sift through the entire paper to remove all issues in terms of English writing. - References List: The references are related to the topic of article, recent, but it is not sufficient, authors should add more references. Some search names in the reference list begin an uppercase letter for each word and others use only an uppercase letter in the first word, authors should standardize style. The references should follow Journal style. Some references do not contain enough details such as references [1], [8] ... etc. Some references are not of prestige. References are not arranged in the text. The authors must accurately double check references list to eliminate all problems. - Abstract: It is vague and does not implicitly provide purpose/problem, methods and results. - The introduction is short and does not contain main contributions. - Literature Review does not contain any written criticism in the form of summaries, which is not what is required of this section. - Methodology Section: It's not clear and unstructured, there should be a scheme showing the methods. Through this methodology, it appears that the research is only an implementation. - Where is the justice in proving the results? There should be comparisons with the results of recent and existing research. Also, analysis and discussion is insufficient. - The conclusion should be written more clearly. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keywords: We suggest that the authors should replace keywords such as "Raspberry Pi" and "Communication System" because these keywords are already found in the article title. It is better that they replace them with other keywords to increase the reach of the article. - Figures 1, 5 and 6 need to be redrawn to appear in high resolution. Why are figures not used in the text? - 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mishall Al-Zubaidie
Department, University & Country	University of Thi-Qar, Iraq