|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Software evaluated** | **Methodology**  | **Evaluation****Criteria** | **Selected software** |
| Shannnon &Rice(2017)*International Journal of Information and Education Technology, Vol. 7, No. 6, June 2017* |  |  | From the ample of technical critiques and tryout from the demonstration courses, this research filtered outthe common input and merged them into three critiquecategories which are Course Building Functions (CBF),Server Functions (SF), and Training and Service (TS).For theCourse Building Functions category, there were eight itemscompared for details of course quality control, interactivetools, template courses, grade book interfaces, social networksubscription, calendar builder, course assessment, andresources sharing. The available functions of monitoringcriteria, interacting interfaces, and assessing tools werecarefully scrutinized in this category.Server Functions category, there weresix items compared for details of file size control, enrollmentprocess, plugins and access control, online/offline function,analytics function, and course archiving function.It is vital forthe users and the institutions to have a freely accessible andquick responding server all the time. The transmission speedand storage capacity with easy access while online or offlinehave been evaluated in this category. The Training and Service category included the threestudied items of user training materials, developer forums andtips, and technical support |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |