



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	The right methodology of research. The research question is clearly stated. The empirical data, quantitative are analyzed in appropriate ways, and written up in ways that are easy to understand. The study conclusions supported are by the analysis. The analysis adequately address the issues raised in the objective of this work.	Agreed
Minor REVISION comments	Government E-procurement projects have been notoriously unsuccessful while engaging vendors in the process have been <u>difficult</u> due to the level of investment expected in terms of providing catalog information to bidders using diverse languages and technologies [37]. The effective nature of the world wide web truly makes bid solicitation, submission, evaluation and award process <u>effective</u> . The E-procurement infrastructural tools can facilitate <u>efficiency</u> , transparency, quality of service, and compliance in the bid selection process. Furthermore, E-procurement has the potential to promote operational <u>efficiency</u> and cost savings in public sector procurement [9].	Difficult was changed to tedious Catalog was changed to catalogue efficiency, transparency, quality of service was changed to Efficiency, Transparency, Quality of Service
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Correction made where necessary