



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_44283
Title of the Manuscript:	Using App Inventor as tool for creating mathematics applications for mobile devices with Android OS
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 synthesised and structured. The use of sub-headings and signposting would help the reader to follow the argument being developed through the paper. 2/ * The analysis is too general. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed. 3/ * Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive. 4/ * The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge. 5/* The Methodology lacked suitable detail. 6/* Methodology of the central work is exposed appropriately. 7/* Research methodology based on research goals is poor on absent. 8/* More recent bibliography is necessary. Furthermore, the reference list is a little bit weak. 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 App Inventor in education to strengthen the background and conclusions of the study: - Papadakis, S., Kalogiannakis, M., Orfanakis, V., & Zaranis, N. (2017). The appropriateness of scratch and app inventor as educational environments for teaching introductory programming in primary and secondary education. International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies (IJWLTT), 12(4), 58-77. - Papadakis, S. & Orfanakis, V. (2018). Comparing novice programing environments for use in secondary education: App Inventor for Android vs. Alice. Int. J. Technology Enhanced Learning, Vol. 10, Nos. 1/2, pp.44–72. - Papadakis S., & Orfanakis V. (2017). The Combined Use of Lego Mindstorms NXT and App Inventor for Teaching Novice Programmers. In: Alimisis D., Moro M., Menegatti E. (Eds.), Educational Robotics in the Makers Era. Edurobotics 2016. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 560, pp.193-204. Springer, Cham - Papadakis, S., Kalogiannakis, M., Orfanakis, V. & Zaranis, N. (2016). Using Scratch and App Inventor for teaching introductory programming in Secondary Education. A case study. International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning, 8, (3/4), 217 – 233. - Papadakis, St., Kalogiannakis, M., Orfanakis, V., Zaranis, N. (2014). Novice Programming Environments. Scratch & App Inventor: a first comparison. In H. M. Fardoun and J. A. Gallud (Eds.) Proceedings of the 2014 Workshop on Interaction Design in Educational Environments (pp 1-7), New York: ACM. 9/* The discussion should be more concise and the outcomes should be discussed in relation to the existing research. The language style of this section has to improve. 10/* Recommendations should also be given for practice and further research. 11/* The academic writing needs work. 12/* Too many syntax and grammar mistakes! 12/* 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		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Stamatis Papadakis</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Crete, Greece</i>