



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_40920</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Investigation Into The Effect of Smartphone Back Button Location On Users' Experience: A case study comparing Apple iPhone and Android UI.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Since the topic is the usability of the positioning of the “Back” button, and the observations where made with 40 students from Sokoto State University, you might want to take into account their language background, since it makes a big difference whether they are used to right-to-left or left-to-right writing systems. It should at the very least be raised as a possible issue, as it might falsify the results.</p> <p>I was a bit surprised by the choice of Samsung Galaxy S3 (a device from 2012) and iPhone 5s (a device from 2013), since many changes in Android and iOS have occurred since then, in particular w.r.t. the position of the back button in Android devices. The references are also all quite old, the newest being from 2012.</p> <p>Also, it is not clear whether the devices where owned by the test users, and how much they were used to the devices from their normal usage. This obviously makes a huge difference.</p> <p><b>What is missing is a statistical analysis about the found results.</b></p> <p>What is even more missing is a discussion of the practical implications of the results.</p>	<p>I did not agree with the reviewers comment on the absence o a section f that discuss the implication of the research findings. The section is present and I have highlighted it for the editors attention. The comment regarding participants' ownership has been acted upon and highlighted in the "Subject Section" of the research. The suggestion on participants writing system has also been included in the "Participant" section.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Some formatting issues, e.g., in the abstract: “Few studies, However have been conducted to investigate the effect of key locations on users performance and experience.” --- I am not listing all because there are many, but the authors should carefully check their grammar, spurious or missing spaces, phrases, inconsistent capitalization, etc., or even better, ask some copy editor, unless the journal editor has manpower to do this.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I am not sure what the point of the paper is, since asking iPhone users to understand an Android GUI and vice-versa seems not very meaningful. Indeed, since a back button is so crucial to all interactions on one's phone, users learn very quickly how to use it on their phone. At the same time, there is no need to know how it works on another platform. What one knows from daily use shapes one's expectations, but I would hesitate to deduce any implications out of the study.</p>	