



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48391
Title of the Manuscript:	Research and Capstone Project Electronic Repository
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>This article presents the description of a project in which the authors have been involved. The article is very easy to read and comprehend. The work done is related to information systems and their operations. Essentially this paper is a presentation of practical work in the field of Information systems. The structure of the paper and its formatting are good. Overall the authors have done good work.</p> <p>The following corrections / improvements are required in the paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The diagrams used are too small to read. Some of the diagrams e.g. fig 2,3,4 etc. should be improved / enlarged so the reader can understand them ii) The paper requires proof reading and correction. There are many sentences that can be improved and written using better construction. (This is not necessary the authors fault because they are not familiar with this language). It is suggested to re-read and improve every paragraph of the paper. iii) IF REWRITTEN MANY PARTS OF THE PAPER CAN BE SHORTENED. THERE IS TOO MUCH REPETITION IN EVERY PART! <p>e.g. if section 3.3Development of the Search Engine is considered</p> <p>Developing search engine confirms the necessity of the module. The module is very relevant in locating and sorting of the information stored in the database. Once the search engine has crawled the contents of the database, it indexes that content based on the occurrence of keyword phrases in each individual record. In developing the search engine using keyword specific in the said study made it more sophisticated and hassle-free locating research and capstone project documents.</p> <p>This can be improved to:</p> <p>Developing of the search engine confirms the necessity of the module. The module is very relevant in locating and sorting the information stored in the database. Once the search engine has crawled the contents of the database, it indexes that content based on the occurrence of keyword phrases in each individual record. When developing the search engine for specific keywords the given study added more automation and simplification for locating research and capstone project documents.</p> <p>THIS IS JUST AN EXAMPLE. ALL THE SECTIONS CAN BE SIMILARLY IMPROVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) There are a number of typing errors in the paper that must be addressed. e.g. 1.2The Significance should read 1.2 The Significance KINDLY GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE PAPER! v) Kindly correct the references in the reference section and make sure that they are cited in the paper! 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Anthony Spiteri Staines
Department, University & Country	University of Malta, Malta