



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11644
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Mamdani and Sugeno Fuzzy Inference Systems for prediction (with application to prices of Fund in Egypt)
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>)



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	1. P.3 line 4: "... to optimize the outputs [6]." → [6] is not listed in references. 2. Reference [5] is not referred in article of the manuscript..	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. There were many published papers to discuss about the comparison of Mamdani FIS and Sugeno FIS. This manuscript presented a Fund price forecasting issue and with a reasonable contribution and experiment results. 2. This manuscript addresses a very interesting topic about Fund price forecasting with two different Fuzzy mythologies. However, the authors demonstrated insufficient related works in this topic. The contributions of this work had not been clearly defined. In the article, only two different FISs experiment results were demonstrated, but no comparison results to other methodology such as other Fund/Stock forecasting papers. 3. The author should add more references which related to the topic of the fund/stock price prediction using fuzzy methodology to prove this work's accuracy and efficiency.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the manuscript presented an important issue and with a reasonable contribution and experiment results.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer