

Peer Review

Review of: "Web-Based Crime Management System for Samara City Main Police Station"

Hasanain Mohammed Manji Al-Rzoky¹

1. Independent researcher

The manuscript presents a clear and practical topic with a feasible development plan. The proposed solution appears implementable, and the text is generally readable. However, the submission reads primarily as a software project plan rather than a scientific article. To meet peer-review standards, the authors should (a) frame explicit research questions or hypotheses, (b) ground the work in relevant literature, (c) define a testable methodology and evaluation strategy, and (d) reduce low-level implementation minutiae (or move them to an appendix/supplementary material).

Strengths

The topic is clear, practically applicable, and feasible.

Structure and language are generally easy to follow.

The implementation plan demonstrates that the authors have considered practical constraints.

Major concerns (actionable)

1. Scientific framing: The manuscript lacks explicit research questions, objectives, and contribution statements. Add a brief paragraph in the Introduction stating the research gap, the specific questions the work answers, and the expected contributions (theoretical, methodological, practical).
2. Literature grounding: The literature review is thin. Cite comparative studies, theoretical work in the domain, and recent empirical papers to show how this work differs from or builds on prior work.
3. Evaluation plan: There is no concrete plan to evaluate effectiveness. Describe the evaluation design

(e.g., user study, benchmarking, metrics), sample size considerations, instruments (e.g., SUS or task-completion metrics), and statistical tests you will use.

4. Excessive implementation detail: Move long code listings, step-by-step installation commands, very detailed UI style guides, and exhaustive server configurations to an appendix or supplementary material. Keep the main text focused on architecture and rationale.

5. References: The manuscript uses too few sources. Include more peer-reviewed articles, standards, and case studies (see recommendations below).

Minor comments

Improve section headings to match a research article template (Introduction, Related Work, Methodology, Results/Evaluation, Discussion, Conclusion).

Proofread for small language and formatting issues.

Consider a concise diagram of the system architecture (one figure) rather than many screenshots.

Recommendation: Major revisions required. The topic is promising, but the manuscript must be reframed with clear research aims and a concrete evaluation plan before it meets the platform's minimum standards.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.