



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) The authors should provide relevant references for the Mamdani fuzzy inference systems and for the Surgeon fuzzy inference systems which they study. (2) The authors should explain in more detail the input data which they use to test the two methods. In particular, the authors should provide more details regarding the sentence "The input has nine membership functions..." which appears on page 3. (3) The authors should provide more details regarding the calculations which they perform in order to obtain the various results which are presented in the tables.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 2: In the sentence: "It is similar to the Mamdani method in many respects", the word "Mamdani" should probably be replaced by "Sugeno".	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer