



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	● I suggest the manuscript needs further proofreading. Too much grammar errors exist in the manuscript, and some descriptions seem not logical. Therefore the author should check this again for assuring the quality of study. ● The introduction is weak because the author should provide more reasons why choose the two ways for prediction. The author just enumerated few studies for discussing the two ways. However, I did see any deep discussion for these. Please provide more description and references on this part. ● As far as I know, many factors (economic indicators) will influence the prices of Fund. However, I can't find the other factors used in this prediction model except "Market conditions". It seems very strange and not reasonable. Please clearly state that how many indicators are used for prediction and what they are? ● Some figures could be omitted, and please provide more descriptions about the inference mechanisms of Mamdani-FIS and Surgeno-FIS. ● With regard to the statistic results, I think the author should improve this part because the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	presented tables and the defined symbols are not clear. For examples: tables 5 and 6 for comparing same thing in different ways, however, their formats are different, and that will make readers confused. Moreover, some tables didn't clear state the symbols "P0, P1, ..., Pn". How can the readers understand each comparison? ● I think the author should provide more insights or suggestions in conclusion remark, not just stated the simple results of the statistical test.	
Minor REVISION comments	Please check format about the references. Please check each title of providing tables.	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer