Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_110440**
Title of the Manuscript:	**AN ELECTRONIC PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR REVENUE COLLECTION IN THE KASENA NANAKANA MUNICIPALITY**
Type of the Article	**Research Article**

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes, This manuscript is very important because it provides an overview of electronic payment systems compared to conventional payment systems.** **Yes, This research topic discusses electronic systems that lead to the development and implementation of an electronic management system for revenue mobilization in Kassena-Nankana DPRD called KNMATPS through empirical evidence.** **Yes, but it needs to be completed and clarified further in the justification of the research method.** **Yes, according to the format of the manuscript provisions.** **Yes. Because, it is written systematically, then based on logical reasoning so that what the author writes is in accordance with common sense. This writing is supported by objective data which is supported by data whose truth has been empirically tested. Objective. Contains correct, valid and relevant theoretical arguments. There is a relationship between empirical and theoretical arguments.** **Yes, References are quite up to date, but references under the last 10 years can be updated again and need to add more relevant reference articles.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Yes**	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Yuniana Cahyaningrum**
Department, University & Country	**IKIP, Indonesia**