

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	The abstract focus clearly on the main point The introduction provide sufficient background Adequate references and resource material Good paper structure Clearly stated purpose and objectives - good Results clearly presented	
Minor REVISION comments	MINOR revisions of punctuation should be made by the authors before paper publication, in order to achieve an improved work Pay attention to the diagram shown in figure 1 (the information shown in each cell must be visible; the arrow connector is moving, etc.). A suggestion in this regard: it would be better if this diagram was not made in word, but in another way.	
Optional/General comments	The topic addressed in this article is of interest to most people, given that each of us, in the age in which we live, interact with a website and at some point, we want to know as much detail as possible, regards the possibility of finding a restaurant, with a certain specificity, located in a certain location. I was really curious to "browse" the Zomato site. It is a very interesting subject for me, considering my field of activity; we appreciated the presentation of the applied methodology and the criteria considered to obtain the results of the study. In a general way, the manuscript is well organized. For this reason I consider that it is publishable and will be of interest to a number of its readers.	

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>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Toderas Mihaela
Department, University & Country	University of Petrosani, Romania