



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_46031
Title of the Manuscript:	E-PROCUREMENT: A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO PUBLIC WORKS TENDERING
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		
Minor REVISION comments	This is quite a good paper. It requires a sentence just before the conclusion which explains the claim for contribution to academic knowledge and two sentences in the conclusion, one to outline the research imitations and the other to consider the suggestions for future research.	<p>This study brought major understanding to the procurement process and its associated architectural approach. The work also proposed an intelligent web service system for orchestration of tenders that satisfies the bidder's preference. The architectural model also promotes a better understanding of the procurement process as a service concept and laid a foundation for the formulation of due process in public enterprises. The tool can be used in the development of an effective self-directed tool for open learning via the web in the area of public procurement process and with little effort, procurement will make mediocre become an expert in the business discipline of public procurement.</p> <p>In future, further studies will be done to break down the user experience factors by altering the elements present in the interface. Such studies would hopefully clarify the relative importance of the functions and the looks that the prototype implements. Studies must also be carried out on how to incorporate the tool into handheld devices with pens and touch screens rather than the mouse and keyboards that necessarily had to be employed in the reported studies. Poor communication between the client and vendors is a major issue to be addressed further. the problem will be mitigated by designing an ontology to aid deeper understanding and serve as a basis for model-driven communication process. Our framework was designed for the acquisition of public works tendering only which can also be adapted for procurement of goods. In the future, the framework will be extended for the procurement of consultants and other services.</p>
Optional/General comments		



[SDI 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>	Correction made as suggested