



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_44060
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPUTER BASED TESTING (CBT) SYSTEM FOR GST EXAMS IN ADAMAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, MUBI
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 (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	The manuscript is of potential interest to the readership of this journal, but there are major issues that must be addressed before the article could be published. 1/ * The literature review should be more carefully synthesized and structured. The use of sub-headings and signposting would help the reader to follow the argument being developed through the paper. 2/ * There does not appear to be an explicit theoretical framework. Currently the manuscript appears to be somewhat descriptive and a theoretical. 3/ * The results section requires far greater organisation and structuring. The analysis is too general, and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed. 4/ * Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive. 5/ * The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge. 6/* The Methodology lacked suitable detail. 7/* The Methodology of the central work is exposed appropriately. 8/* Research methodology based on research goals is poor on absent. 9/* More recent bibliography is necessary. Furthermore, the reference list is a little bit weak. Before I can make a final decision on the paper, please refer to more references and upload a new version. It is suggested that the author(s) can consider the following paper related to the use of various forms of ICT in university to strengthen the background and conclusions of the study: Papadakis, S., Kalogiannakis, M., Sifaki, E., & Vidakis, N. (2017). Access Moodle Using Smart Mobile Phones. A Case Study in a Greek University. In Interactivity, Game Creation, Design, Learning, and Innovation (pp. 376-385). Springer, Cham. 10/* The academic writing needs work. 11/* The discussion should be more concise and the outcomes should be discussed in relation to the existing research. 12/* The language style of this section has to improve. 13/* Recommendations should also be given for practice and further research. 14/* The references must be written according the APA Style! 15/* Very bad quality of images and figures!!! In preparing a revised manuscript, please also include a table of how you have responded to each of the issues listed above point by point.	
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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Papadakis Stamatios
Department, University & Country	University of Crete, Greece