Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_113528**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ExamAssessor Tool: An Automated System for Efficient Answer Sheet Evaluation**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

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)**	**1. Yes. The manuscript proposes a novel and innovative solution that uses machine learning to automate the evaluation of subjective answers, which is a challenging task that usually requires human intervention and expertise.** **2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.** **3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive, it clearly summarizes the main topic and purpose of the manuscript in a coherent and informative way.** **4. Partially, in the Optional/General comments section it is described in more detail.** **5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. It follows the scientific method and presents valid and reliable results that support the hypotheses and objectives of the study.** **6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. They cover the relevant literature and provide adequate background and context for the study.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. Yes, however, there are several punctuation errors, so it is necessary to do a thorough review to detect and correct them.	
Optional/General comments	1. I recommend that figure 17, which describes the system design, be placed at the beginning and then describe the details related to the proposed model. 2. I strongly recommend extending the conclusions section in which the challenges faced in the use and adoption of the software for teachers are discussed; likewise, I also suggest adding a discussion section where the limitations of the proposed model are commented on. 3. It is essential to look for a bibliographic reference to support the sentence in the article "… punctuation marks and numbers… may not add much value to the analysis…" 4. In order to adequately validate the proposed model, a manual analysis of the answers classified as "incorrect" is required to determine the causes, which could also be attributed to the model or even to the spelling. 5. A publishable study related to your development could go in the direction of detecting the reasons why a large percentage of teachers are not motivated or have doubts about using the type of software proposed.	

Review Form 1.7

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Daniel Edahi Urueta Hinojosa**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad Politécnica del Estado de Guerrero, México**