

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_84214
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES IN USING COMPUTERIZED SYSTEMS FOR ADMISSION INTO COLLEGES OF EDUCATION
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Authors discussed about computerized systems for admission in abstract. Which type? What is computerized systems for a reader with no knowledge about the field? Keywords are wrong. Students or challenges are not keywords.</p> <p>“The study aims to evaluate the computerized system used in admitting students into public colleges of education, with particular reference to the educational colleges affiliated with the University of Cape Coast.” This is a case study that you can mention in abstract. Therefore, you cannot generalize the whole conclusion to other educational institutions.</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 should be Conclusion not in conclusion and so on.</p> <p>In general, manuscript is a survey of the literature about computerized systems for education admission. I suggest to change title to a review or survey. I see that the study has one sample user study but it is not enough. Another option is that you summarize the first pages (almost more than half is talking about literature and background) into few, and make the paper as a case study.</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Noted</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	