



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6356
Title of the Manuscript:	Embracing Contingency Planning for University Information Resources
Type of the Article	Application based

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	Authors developed a model to develop the Contingency Planning of University Information Resources. They declare general and known issues. Their work includes local specs and used data is very small. Therefore analysis results do not have general properties. So work has minor or no novelty. If authors proposed a general model to develop develop the Contingency Planning of University Information Resources and they test their model using generic data it would be novel work.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer