

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_86957
Title of the Manuscript:	Usability Evaluation: Zomato a restaurant search and discovery service website
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The work is somehow new but several limitations from the English to the technical hinder to grasp the main point of the work, some of them are listed below:</p> <p>My Comments and Suggestions to Authors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The abstract is not convincing and is disorganized, it should be refined to precisely illustrate what authors have done in this paper within 200 words. 2- Proofread the manuscript, with particular attention to grammatical mistakes and improved the formatting of text, figures, and tables. 3- In the Introduction part, the new features of the proposed method and the main advantages of the results over others should be clearly described. 4- The contributions presented in this paper are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 5- The literature has to be strongly updated with some relevant and recent papers focused on the fields dealt with the manuscript. 6- The English language of this paper too weak, please send the paper to the native speaker, there are several sentences which too poor. 7- The writing of the manuscript. There are a many incomplete sentences or sentences without subjects. 8- Many details are missing and others unclear. 9- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions. 10- The manuscript is hard to be understood and words should be improved. 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Maad M. Mijwil
Department, University & Country	Baghdad College of Economic Sciences University, Iraq