



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_24989
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN INTRODUCTORY COMPUTER COURSE ON STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDE
Type of the Article	Original Research paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Generally, the paper is based on a research work to determine whether the introductory computer course in Preparatory Year Program (PYP) influences students' performance and attitude towards computer studies in Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. In this context, the author(s) provide a report regarding to performed evaluation studies and obtained results. The paper has a remarkable effort but before it can be published in the BJMCS, also some minor revisions should be done. The related revisions are: 1- The Introduction section seems short. In order to improve it, it is better to discuss about objectives of the work under this section rather than next sections. It can also be better to provide a final paragraph introducing organization of the content. 2- While citing references with numbers, they should not be ordered alphabetically at the end of the paper. Rather the references should be provided according to their appearance order. 3- After some main titles there are blanks before starting to sub-titles. It is better to provide some brief explanations about the related sections, rather than	Thank you for your thorough review and valuable suggestions. We greatly appreciate the reviewer's efforts to carefully review the paper. The authors agree with the reviewer and have made changes in the manuscript. As suggested by the reviewer, we have formatted the introduction part and references are ordered as they appear in the text. We have also added the text after the main title and added new references (2014, 2015) as suggested.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	starting immediately to the sub-section. 4- Number of total references is OK. But there should be some more recent references in order to keep the content up-to-date and improve general quality. I suggest adding references from especially 2014, 2015, and even 2016 (i.e. in publish, online view). Thanks the author(s) for their valuable efforts to form this paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It would be better if the author(s) can provide more figures (including i.e. graphics, schemas) in order to improve attractiveness of the content.	We have added two figures in the text.