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)

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	1. **The abstract of the paper needs revision.** 2. **The questionnaire includes question like "I think I would use the system frequently" needs to be reviewed as the word think gives a perception to the respondent as he/she is not sure about. Rather I would suggest question like "How frequently will you/I use the system"** 3. **As discussed in point no. 2 the questions need to be reframed.** 4. **The study is based on the questionnaire prepared and the conclusion is on the basis of the same therefore the same study may be conducted again with reframed questions.**	Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions. 1. As you suggested, we have revised the abstract of our revised manuscript [marked]. 2. The original SUS questionnaire was used in our study. 3. Therefore (in point no.2), we think that it is not appropriate to change the original. 4. According to the statements in Point 2 and 3, we think that the study is not required to conduct again. 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].
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	