



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The most of the comments were covered or clarified. The paper has been improved. However, there are a few comments not covered yet: The Comment number 8 from the previous review was not covered properly: <i>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 zero risk) of future returns, thereby bringing forward the long awaited advancement for the Nation (Conclusions Section);</i> <i>The risk analysis was not part of the study. It should be demonstrated if the risk is zero.</i> The explanation from the author is not enough. If the Risk Analysis is out of the scope of this research it is better not include the risks because it needs to be demonstrated. In any case the risk won't be zero. Probably the risks will be low, but never zero. Please, review the text, clarifying this. The Comment number 10 from the previous review about the software investment options was clarified into the review, but not into the paper. For the comment 10, as well the author mentions: <i>This was deemed unnecessary because open-source development is not a trend in developing countries such as Nigeria.</i> Could it be clarified in the paper and to be supported by references? The comment with the number 11 from the previous review about the university population growth rate was clarified, proposing it as future researches, into the review. However, it has not been mentioned into the paper. Why the paper is not including this Section of Future Researches, clarifying this? The comment number 12 from the previous review was clarified proposing it as future researches. This comment is really relevant because the confidence on the results could be increased if the research takes into account other different costs of the software acquisition such as software maintenance, upgrade cost, training, organizational impacts and so on. It is the same issue already mentioned before. Why the paper is not including this Section of Future Researches, clarifying this?	- The reviewer's suggestion has been implemented. We agree that risk in this regard cannot be zero. We have adopted the suggested phrase "low risk". - DONE! This has been clarified (with reference) and included in the future work section of the paper. - DONE! Please see future work section. - DONE! Please see future work section. - DONE! A future work section has been introduced and this issue has been addressed therein. - Rectified! The scope of the statement has been reduced to reflect the scope of the work has suggested by the reviewer.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

6. From the comment 13 (previous review). 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. The suggestion is to change this phrase properly.	
--	--