Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_46394**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Development and Implementation of a Tool for Website Usability Measurement**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Papers**

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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	**Abstract:** Please improve your abstract. Make sure you describe your paper properly. You should make sure you have this sentence in your abstract. "This paper presents …. Put your title here…". In this study, then explain what you developed, highlight the merit of your study and describe the comparative studies. Highlight your results. **Introduction:** In your paper, you should start with the general overview within your study. Then, cite between 15 to 20 references in your paper, highlight the strength and weakness of the past research work. In the last paragraph, you should have this: "This paper presents…. Put your title here…". In this study, ….explain what you will present…. Describe in brief the results of your study and highlight its merit over the others. Describe that you performed a comparative study to highlight the strength of your work. Explain what problems you have solved in your study. Make sure no figures, tables, equations and their equivalence. **Methods/Methodology:** Present your methods clearly with the proper flowchart, research framework, algorithms and all the relevant equations and background theory. Whatever you proposed or developed should be explained here. **Results and Discussion** Introduce all your figures and tables properly. Then explain them, highlight what you observed. Perform analysis to show that your results got the significance to answer your problems. (Website-1 and Website-2 are not clearly defined – type of website) **Conclusion** In the conclusion section, start your sentence with this: "This paper has presented…. Put your title….explain what you have achieved from the study. Highlight the merit of your study and what would be the future scope of the study. As it is now, we cannot see what problems that have been solved. Please address this issue.	Thank you for your thoughtful and thorough review of our revised manuscript. **Abstract:** As you commented, we have improved the abstract of our revised manuscript [marked]. **Introduction:** As you suggested, we have improved the Information Section and cite 20 references in our paper [marked]. **Methods/Methodology:** We have explained the developed tool in this section [marked]. **Results and Discussion:** As you suggested, we have improved this Section [marked]. **Conclusion:** This study presents the development and implementation of a tool for measuring website usability. It is important that the individual responds to the questions and gives the score quickly by the software. Thus, it is important that the web page provides quick information about the usability status. So the tool is a decision making tool. These explanations have been added to the Conclusion section [marked]. Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.
Minor REVISION comments	**1. Introduction** "There are many assessment methods …….(SUCH AS)?" - It is better to provide example as we cannot expect the readers to know what the available methods are. "Existing problems on the website are identified." >>what are they? State the problems to be solved here. **2. Material/methodology** Since SUS is chosen, explain more on the SUS method to provide better understanding for readers (framework, flowchart etc.) **3. Insufficient citation to support the research.**	1 and 2. We have considered your suggestions. Thank you very much. 3. We have cite 20 references in our revised paper.
Optional/Generalcomments	Please overhaul your paper.	

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)*	