SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJAST_14774**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Data Warehousing for a Public University in Kenya**
Type of the Article	**Short Research 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** *(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Misleading introduction; it should align with abstract. Spell out all acronyms the first time. What about INPUTTING data? GIGO issue is big. Explain why data warehouse is the most valuable tech (citation is general; author needs to explain own community). Writing has much jargon (especially around lines 88-110); clarify terms, especially cube. What is the basis for data elimination (line 113)? Explain OLAP (e.g., 122), especially in terms of fee (what is that about??). It is unclear the priority issue: money, target populations, etc. Where did 80% come in? (line 162)	
Minor REVISION comments	Ms should be MS. Staff usually refers to clerks; define staff.	
Optional/General comments	Proofread for grammar/syntax errors. Poorly organized, with poor transition of topics	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**USA**