



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_51163
Title of the Manuscript:	Mobile Phones: A Panacea for the Implementation of e-voting in Nigeria
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>)

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	Check that direct lifting from reviewed works of literature is avoided. Use free online plagiarism check tools to reduce the occurrence of this.	Most of the literature materials were previous works of the author. Those that were not the author's literatures have been revised.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: The abstract is very ambiguous with very lengthy sentences. (It is almost like an introduction). A typical abstract should give a brief account of what was done in the study, how it was done and the results obtained.</p> <p>Keyword: The keywords should be ordered alphabetically.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction was properly presented by the authors. They were able to clearly establish the reason for adoption of m-voting over e-voting system in developing. However, for an academic work, flying phrases such as: "and so on" should be avoided.</p> <p>Literature review: The presentation of the reviewed literature was properly done. However, the presentations of the related works need to be modified. The author should ensure that capture recent studies in this domain (I.e. works within the last 5 years) Also, the reviewed literatures should not be presented in isolation. They should be linked with phrases such as: Also, Similarly, In addition...</p> <p>Conclusion: Recommendations for further studies should be included in the conclusion</p>	<p>The abstract have been revised. Some contents therein that are of less significance have been removed.</p> <p>The keywords have been rearranged alphabetically.</p> <p>Every occurrence of the phrase "and so on" has been expunged from the Introduction sub-section of the manuscript.</p> <p>Recent works of 2016, 2017 and 2018 were captured in the review of relevant literatures.</p> <p>A future research subject has been included in the conclusion.</p>
Optional/General comments	The article have been well written. However, minor revision is required to make it better.	Your through review of the manuscript is well appreciated. Thank you.



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>	