



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15634
Title of the Manuscript:	Microcontroller Based Office Visitor Notifier System (MBONS)
Type of the 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>)



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	The paper presents a visitor notification system for office-like environments and its preliminary implementation using COTS platforms. The paper just presents a homemade prototype implementation composed by a microcontroller and a LCD. With reference to Figure 2, authors lack to explain how the communication between the lower officer's device/host and the higher ones is implemented: is it through wired or wireless links? Does this require any extra installation costs/efforts? Moreover, a careful review of the state of the art in the similar field is missing as well as an even minimal comparison against the solutions available. A quick google search returns many solutions available in the market, either commercial (including expensive as well as cheap technologies) and free (open source) solutions. See below for a list of possible references, which is obviously incomplete. Furthermore, with reference to Figure 1 as compared with Figures 8a and 8b, it is quite hard to understand how the information related with the visitors (i.e., their names) has been efficiently implemented through a simple numeric keypad. The feeling of the present reviewer is that the tests that were performed have been negatively affected by the fact that most probably the voice call between the players (higher and lower officers) was still used, then the	Major review is done and more reference from existing model was consider to improvement



SDI Review Form 1.6

	benefit of using the proposed solution is very marginal. Finally, aside from the simpler scenarios, i.e., a secretary and his/her boss, another interesting feature available in the on-line solutions and not considered here is the possibility to print the visitor badges. This might be (quite easily) taken into account in any extension of the MBONS system. [1] LAKSHA Visitor Management System, http://sourceforge.net/projects/visitormanagement [2] B-Visit - Visitor Management System, http://sourceforge.net/projects/visitorbadge [3] EasyLobby® Visitor Management, http://www.hidglobal.com/visitor-management/kiosks-and-self-registration [4] http://lobbyguard.com/products/ [5] LobbyWorks Visitor Management Suite, http://www.honeywellaccess.com/products/access-control-systems/visitor-management/33510.html [6] https://signwithenvoy.com/	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are several typos and Grammar errors in the text, requiring a careful revision. Just a few examples follow: - Multiple times there is a “an” with a word starting with consonant. - Line 43: although “MBONS” appears already in the title, it is good practice to always expand the acronyms the first time they are used in the text. - The measurement unit for the frequency is Hz, while at lines 144 and 145 appears a weird “MGZ”. Moreover, according to the SI Conventions, a space should be left between the numerical value and its unit symbol (http://www.npl.co.uk/reference/measurement-units/si-conventions). - Line 186 presents the second (2.) item of an enumerated list, but the first one (1.) is missing. - Line 208: authors refer to “Figure 6 below”. Either they refer to the Figure 6 which is above, in the current paper’s layout, or they refer to Figure 7 which is in the next page. Moreover, there are some figures that are practically unreadable. For instance, this applies to Figure 4 and Figure 6, and the latter one also looks like a PDF capture screen: maybe it should be redrawn.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My opinion is that there should be some more elements technically sound and at least a comparison against other products/projects addressing similar issues, i.e., a review of the current state of the art is fully missing and is expected in a next review round (if any).	The ideal is a good observation and this was consider in the corrected version