



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_53810
Title of the Manuscript:	Research Archiving As a Tool for Research Continuity: A Look at Bowen University, Nigeria
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>The topic is relevant and the authors present a use case of electronic archive systems for research work. The manuscript gives nice presentation of the existing literature in domain of archival systems mentioning some of the frameworks and solutions.</p> <p>The main drawback of this manuscript is lack of novelty, although the good example of archive system implementation is presented. Authors should provide better explanation about the innovations brought by the manuscript.</p> <p>The survey analysis in section 3 could be better explained (eg. some demographic analysis of respondents could be added).</p> <p>Authors should improve text formatting above Figure 4 and the sentence: "Figure 4 below shows the activities that can be performed by all" is not finished. In section 4 Table 6 is mentioned in text and it should be Table 5.</p> <p>Section 4 could be improved by adding figure with logical architecture of archive system.</p> <p>Better explanation of system testing on BUPAS should be added, as well as explanation of usability testing. It would be good to present performance analysis also.</p> <p>Conclusion should be expanded with suggestions for future work.</p> <p>Although English is generally good, some typing errors must be corrected.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jelena Šuh
Department, University & Country	Organizational Sciences Belgrade, Serbia