|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 try  out from the demonstration courses, this research filtered out  the common input and merged them into three critique  categories which are Course Building Functions (CBF),  Server Functions (SF), and Training and Service (TS).  For the  Course Building Functions category, there were eight items  compared for details of course quality control, interactive  tools, template courses, grade book interfaces, social network  subscription, calendar builder, course assessment, and  resources sharing. The available functions of monitoring  criteria, interacting interfaces, and assessing tools were  carefully scrutinized in this category.  Server Functions category, there were  six items compared for details of file size control, enrollment  process, plugins and access control, online/offline function,  analytics function, and course archiving function.  It is vital for  the users and the institutions to have a freely accessible and  quick responding server all the time. The transmission speed  and storage capacity with easy access while online or offline  have been evaluated in this category.  The Training and Service category included the three  studied items of user training materials, developer forums and  tips, and technical support |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |