



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the paper needs revision of spelling and English language (probably it isn't in the final form) - more consistent literature review or/and more references for a more solid scientific substantiation of the paper - conclusions are too summary and too general without concrete references to the content and the results of the paper - I think it should be more relevant if the introduction of the paper would contain considerations about main topics of the article: the metrics, the ERP system implementation process, the need to use metrics to evaluate the ERP implementation etc. 	
Optional/General comments	Some optional recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more emphases on necessity and importance of the proposed metrics - some results (effects) obtained after usage of the proposed metrics - identification and presentation of a few limits of the proposed metrics - more comparisons with other metrics presented in literature or used in industry 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihai Gianina
Department, University & Country	"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati, Romania