



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_23954
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN OF AN INTEGRATED COMPUTERIZED PHARMACY INVENTORY MONITORING SYSTEM (ICPIMS): A CASE OF UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR TEACHING HOSPITAL (UCTH)
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is very weak paper that can have a high potential to be published, but this can be achieved only if it will be rewritten with major changes. Below I'm explaining some of my doubts. The first one is about its originality (especially about some of its parts). The weakest point of this paper is a fact that many of its parts are directly copied from other papers or www pages. This is not the exact evidence that the whole paper is a case of plagiarism (made for example of one, other paper), because there are in the text many reference links, but I think that it will be very good to rewrite many of its parts into own author's words. Now we can find in the paper many sentences that are the same like in other paper or www resources. For example: Lines 141-148 are directly taken from M.Sc project report authored by Ele, Sylvester Igbo: par. 3.2, page 17, (http://www.unn.edu.ng/publications/files/Ele.pdf) Introduction is a compilation of sentences from articles presented on http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/en/d/Js7919e/10.html and http://www.slideshare.net/abahnassi/lecture-three-management-cycle-part-3 Definition of pharmacy (line 81) is directly (with unchanged form) taken from https://pharmablog24.wordpress.com/tag/definition-of-	The said work referred to here by the reviewer if the M.Sc thesis of the lead author. In literature review, we by and large review the work of others as regard the concept under consideration. In this case we merely quoted the work of these authors and cited them accordingly. Nevertheless, we have effects the correction as noted by the reviewer. What the reviewer considers weakness in this article is not weakness in itself. All issues regarding figures have been identified and corrected as noted by the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	pharmacists/ Figure 1 (lines 96-108) taken (there is no reference) from http://www.bioplanassociates.com/publications/articles/BPIBioPlanDISTRIBIndiaTodayOct08.pdf with one minor change. Lines 47-49 directly from http://yakushi.pharm.or.jp/FULL_TEXT/125_5/pdf/427.pdf. These evidences forced me to ask authors to rewrite first two parts of their paper. Another weakness of this paper is fact that it is written in the way that is understandable only for authors. For example, in Sect. 2.1 it will be good to give some comments (explanations) to proposed diagram (available in Figure 2). It show high level diagram for proposed system but in this section there isn't any word of comment. Moreover, there is no reference in the text to this Figure. The same is in the case of Figures 3 and 4 – again, no references in the text, and no good explanations about use case diagram (Fig. 3) and class diagram (Fig. 4), which is very important for the paper because it presents DDL diagram. Its description is very short, even more, at line 185, we have: "... For lack of time, this paper will capture the..." – very strange, why <i>the lack of time</i>, this is a paper not a monologue! Tables 1-10 – no explanations and any comments in the text. Proposed database is not described in the paper. We have a presentation of tables but there is no compatibility with diagram in Fig. 4.	reviewer. Concerning the class diagram (fig. 4), all classes in the class diagram are treated as entities in the database. Not all the attributes considered in the database that are covered in the class diagram for lack of space. If the reviewer can take a good look at it again he/she will agree that there is a strong compatibility between the two.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		