



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	I think this is an interesting area of study. I am not sure how ethical this is to get students to pay for use (increasing burden) it seems and for the university to profit from IT investments. Notwithstanding my ethical concerns, my practical and immediate concerns are that benefits of IT investments are difficult to quantify because it depends on a whole range of factors, perhaps most important "appropriate use" which leads to "impacts". The model offered here is overly simplistic. It assumes that somehow IT leads to process improvements and this realises into benefits. IT can lead to additional costs such as a call centre to manage more complex queries. Furthermore the business model is problematic. Here students pay for IT service and it is assumed that as student number grows usage of the system will also grow. However user behaviour is not linear. They can choose to use or ignore IT. I suggest the author reads about the IT productivity paradox and a host of models proposed by economists trying to measure the value of IT. A better model would try and simulate dynamic use impacts and process impacts.	Unfortunately, this is the practise in the Nigerian university system. We have included new references to support these claims. Furthermore, the concerns raised by the reviewer are understandable. We have addressed most of this in the concluding sections of our paper, stating that NOT all parameters and human behavioural uncertainties has been considered – well, why predicting models are mere estimates anyway. The question of how close to the real life system is our result or simulation is the question of scope. We acknowledge that there are other areas to be considered in future work. This however, does not deny this work if its significance. The presented model is based on correct mathematical formulation technique and the programmatic implementation is well suited. Finally, the authors believe that originality is relative and in this context, this work is original enough and publishable.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	As it stands, the model offers nothing original in my opinion. Technically it relies too much on its assumption about the population.	
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract and introduction do not follow standard academic writing guidelines. For instance, instead of saying “uses certain assumptions” in abstract, state the assumptions. In the introduction, need to reflect on why readers will be interested in this question: What will be the future population (estimated) of a Nigerian 49 university given the present population and assuming a 50 constant growth rate? More thought needs to be given on the problem that the author(s) are attempting to solve.	The abstract of this paper is highly concise and deliberately so. The introductory section and other sections of this paper contain the detailed explanation of the techniques and approach adopted. Done in the 3rd paragraph of section 1.
Optional/General comments	Unfortunately, the model does not capture the “parameters which affects the real life system” General writing, presentation and packaging or paper can be improved. E.g The formulae in lines 180 etc were distorted. Perhaps the model should consider the implication of increasing student burden.	Other uncovered parameters will be considered in future work. DONE! This has been improved. The model reflects the situation of the system. We have included new references to back up these claims.