



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_46085
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION METRICS FOR ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SOLUTION – A CASE OF KIBABII UNIVERSITY
Type of the 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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are a lot of grammatical mistakes. - There are a lot of unfinished sentences, for ex.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Line 8 o Line 178, o etc. - How to prove that the proposed metrics is valid? - This paper is like a story about implementing an ERP System. 	<p>In prove of the valid of the metrics a based on theoretical aspect and showed the extreme cases will be zero and 100. Also based Briand criteria for size metrics. I have also added expert opinion from Kenya Nation audit office when we showed them how we used the metrics to determine the level payment. They declared our approach and metrics to be valid.</p> <p>As whether the paper like story of implementing ERP yes. The paper was based on experiences on implementing one and solution we provided when we realised there was no metrics to determine the level implementation. We came with metrics that we are now disseminating</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		