



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15460
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Electronic Records Maintenance at Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 paper notes that at Africa University, volumes of electronic records are created on a daily basis. Because little is known on the strengths and weaknesses of current electronic records maintenance policies, procedures and practices at Africa University, this paper aims at filling this knowledge gap. However, the used research methodology is simple and results are not complete so that the paper has not explained its evident novelty academically and also not expressed the importance to solve the problem. Analysis from the collected data lacks of the stronger persuasion. Conclusion does not give clear and important meaning resulted from the paper research.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<i>The references cited in the paper are mostly ones published too early. Adding recent reference is suggested.</i> The paper discusses maintenance of electronic records. The study revealed that there is no effective maintenance of electronic records at Africa University. However, the paper did not give sounder suggestion for solving the situation. Overall, I consider that it is consistent with the BJESBS objectives after a big modification has been done.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Tianjin Chengjian University, China