



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_45051
Title of the Manuscript:	Designing Smart Campus Using Smart technologies: Towards a Smart City Information System
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>)

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	There are grammatical errors in the writing style that should be checked and amended. Also some more diagrams should be added to explain the system composition and workings. E.g. the structure of a smart campus and its layers. The conclusion is too short please elaborate The references need to be properly aligned Some sentences do not make sense. The word 'Informatization' used through the paper does not make sense. Kindly use a better suited word or restructure the sentences with other words. KINDLY FIND A WORD DOC ATTACHED WITH SUGGESTED CHANGES/ CORRECTIONS HIGHLIGHTED.	A thorough proof reading was done to eliminate the grammatical error as pointed out by the reviewers. A diagram was introduced to explain the composition and working of the new system as seen in Figure 2 (Proposed Smart Campus Model) The conclusion was elaborated to capture the necessary concepts needed in a CONCLUSION. The referencing style was reviewed, APA format of referencing was adopted throughout the paper as required by the reviewer. Words such as 'Informatization' was changed, sentences were structured and better words was used make the paper grammatically sound.
Minor REVISION comments	The layout of the paper can be improved.	
Optional/General comments	On the whole the paper is quite readable and interesting and covers a lot of work. However it should be improved as suggested.	

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)	