



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6356
Title of the Manuscript:	Embracing Contingency Planning for University Information Resources
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The main part of the work describes the concept of contingency planning for information systems and give detail evaluation and discussion. The authors briefly mention in Section 1.8 that their contingency plan model is based on the existing ISO/IEC 24762:2008 model. While the reviewer appreciates the great effort spent, the novelty of their work and the technical contribution are not clear. Since this work is submitted to a journal on "Applied Science and Technology", making these points standing out is important. At its current form, this paper reads more like a report rather than a technical or research paper. The authors are suggested to reorganize their work and increase the attractiveness to potential readers. I am interested in learning how the proposed model would be generalized to other universities. The authors should discuss its extension and potential issues for such a generalization.	The Methodology part of the Abstract has been revised. An opening paragraph has been added to the Discussion in Section 3.4. A statement has been added in the Conclusion in Section 4
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	For citing references in the paper, it should read well when removing the reference sign "[]" since the reference sign could appear in superscript for a different paper template. For example, on page 1: "According to [2]" should be rephrased as "According to Hoffman [2]". Check the entire paper for such changes.	This has been corrected in Hoffman (1.2); Smith and Sherwood (1.4); Chow (1.4); Heikkinen and Sarkis (1.4); Wong et al (1.4); Mugenda and Mugenda (3.1); Mitome et al (3.2.4.)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	On Page5: Subsection heading “3.1” should be “2.2”.	Corrected section numbering
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper reads well with some minor grammar errors. For example, on Page 5, the first paragraph under Section 3.1, “Another set of a questionnaire was” should be “Another set of questionnaires was” or simply “Another set was”. In Section 4, the last sentence in the third paragraph: “developing IS contingency plan that prevent, mitigate and ensure ...” should be ““developing an IS contingency plan that prevents, mitigates and ensures ...” or “developing IS contingency plans that prevent, mitigate and ensure ...” The authors should go over the paper in a solid pass to correct grammar errors.	Corrected grammatical errors in 3.1; third paragraph of section 4