



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_13066
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting the Yield of Academic Software Investments in Nigerian Universities
Type of the Article	Original 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 <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	1. The Model Assumptions (Section 5.1) are describing the scope of the research. These model assumptions are clearly limiting too much the research because it is only considering from the Academic Software point of view three types of systems to support: • student record management, • semester course registration and • Semester online result access modules. It is necessary to argue why these modules represent the most relevant part of the Academic Software in Nigeria. 2. The title of the paper is "<i>Forecasting the Yield of <u>Academic Software</u> Investments in Nigerian Universities.</i>" However the type of Software considered into the research should be clarified into the paper in several sections. Mainly into the introduction and the section where the model is described. 3. The global scope of the research could be clarified into an additional Section, including several aspects as the type of software, the number of universities included or the population.	1. Modelling highly unpredictable real life systems (such as the Nigerian university system) often come with some assumptions that limits the scope of the research; the academic software systems highlighted were specifically targeted because they reflect the current situation of things in the country at the time of carrying out this research. 2. The clarification has been done in sections 1 and 3. At later sections, we have dealt with the model (which is now an abstraction of the problem) algebraically and numerically. 3. We will consider this aspect for future work when we evaluate the accuracy of this model and its performance.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. Several issues mentioned into the paper need to be supported by references (not included): • <i>Every Nigerian university that is yet to automate one manual process or the other is apparently having the same set of challenges.</i> • <i>Till this moment, many university stakeholders have also considered purchasing academic software as "acquisition of liability" rather than asset</i> • <i>The common practice in the country (Nigeria) is that some of these modules attract charges from the student users.</i> • <i>Students often purchase scratch/PIN (Personal Identification Number) cards to use these modules.</i> 5. According to the Introduction Section, the Section 2 of the Paper includes the reasons why universities have to generate revenue internally and how software purchase can be a good instrument in this regard. Please, clarify both issues into the Section 2. The references included are adequate to the subject, but the paper is not including all these reasons clearly and the paper doesn't demonstrate how SW purchase can be a good instrument in this regard.	4. DONE! All this facts have been supported with appropriate references. 5. This is done in the last paragraph of section 2. 6. DONE! We have included a number of references here. 7. DONE! This has been explained. 8. Risk Analysis is out of the scope of this work. However, we will consider this in future research. 9. DONE! Reference included. 10. This was deemed unnecessary because open-source development is not a trend in developing countries such as Nigeria. 11. We will consider this in future work. The scope is kept concise for now. We also appreciate the multifaceted perspectives of this research area. 12. This comment is addressed in (11) above. 13. This is acknowledged. Also, (11) above addresses this.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. The major software modules deployed across several Nigerian universities included into the Section 3 needs to be confirmed (the source of this information). It is really important for the research and it needs to be supported by references or sources. 7. Explain clearly into the paper the reason why all the modules deployed across several Nigerian universities (already mentioned into the Section 3) were not included into the research. 8. According to the paper this work is intended to serve as an assurance for private investors to put fund into educational software investment with optimism (and <u>zero risk</u>) of future returns, thereby bringing forward the long awaited advancement for the Nation (Conclusions Section); The risk analysis was not part of the study. It should be demonstrated if the risk is zero. 9. Part of the scope of the research is based on the sentence: <i>Not all students are interested in checking their results online</i>. Please, include some data or sources about this subject. 10. Clarify if the research took into account all the software investment options. Was the open source model considered into this research?	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	11. According to the model assumptions included into the research, university population growth rate is constant as a function of time. Is it not possible to get this information from the history data in order to increase the confidence on the research? It should be clarified. This assumption is really relevant to the research and is the base for some of the conclusions. 12. The main issue with this paper is the scope of the research already mentioned in other comments and that the study is not taking into account other considerations about the costs of the software acquisition such as software maintenance, upgrade cost, training, organizational impacts and so on. According to the most of the studies in this subject, these costs represent a high percentage of the global cost. The research should be completed with this analysis. Several Cost models could be referenced and these references could improve the quality of the research.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	13. The Section 7 mentions: <i>Finally, the significance of this research is strong and crucial to the national growth of the country (Nigeria) in education and information technology in general.</i> The scope of the research is not so big. The research is only applied to the SW Academic Investments.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	14. In the Section 1 (INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM DESCRIPTION), the problem to be solved is not described. This section is only an introduction to the paper. 15. The scope of the research, already suggested as a new Section of the Paper, could be part of the Problem Description. 16. Review the format of the equations. It is not readable. 17. It seems that the figure 1 is not part of the research. It is only a reference. Please, confirm it. 18. Please, do not duplicate the information: graphic 1 and table: are they the same information?	14. The 3rd paragraph of section 1 has addressed this. 15. This suggestion is has been addressed in previous comments. 16. DONE! 17. It was referenced in the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2. We don't deem it necessary to refer to Figure 1 more than once. 18. Figure 1 aids the visualization of the rise in student enrolment. Table 1 is as lifted from the referenced source. This is not considered a duplicate.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	19. The number of references about the subject should be increased. Mainly about the Investments in Software and the new software cost models in order to improve the conclusions and the scope of the research.	19. DONE! This has been increased. More grounds will be covered in future research.