



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14714
Title of the Manuscript:	Software Quality Improvement Using Force-field Analysis
Type of the Article	Full paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The Introduction Section especially is written like a thesis with many sub-headings. The author(s) need to restructure manuscript like a journal article	Sir, I guess this paper is supposed to be an empirical research, giving details about the motivation, the entire adventure and experience of the field work. The paper is an inspiration picked from what and how I conducted a field research on Nigerian indigenous software systems with a view to alleviating the constraints and reinforcing the supporting factors. This is why I felt such details should be accounted for. Without it, the paper is incomplete.
Minor REVISION comments	The author(s) at times refer to 'I' and sometimes 'We' The author(s) need to be consistent – Is it 'I' or 'We'? The main objective of the research is to propose a software quality improvement model. However, the author(s) could strengthen the contribution of the study. In other words strengthen what is it that the study is contributing to the body of knowledge.	Thanks for the observation. In the research work, over 180 Common users were personally interviewed and 15 National Headquarters of Indigenous Companies and Software Industries were visited. Some devices were put in place to capture the interviewees' comments and to have a first-hand report of what and how the power users make use of their software systems. In actualizing this, I employed some ad-hoc workers (e.g the camera man, the boy who was holding the voice recorder while I conducted the interview etc). This is why, sometimes I intermittently used "I" and "We". Without these ad-hoc staff I could not have personally been able to harness the information I wanted. I only employed them and instructed them on what to do. However, I will change it as instructed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Sir, in most cases especially in Nigeria, there is always a communication gap between the developers and software users. The common users often complain that the software developers could not develop a system that addresses their working process in 100 percent context. While the developers in the other end, claimed that although the software users may know what they wanted, they do not know how to explicitly describe or explain them. Thus, the developers decided to give them (the users) what they perceive would be useful in their work. This is the conflict I tried to resolve – “Bridging the gap between users’ right and the developers’ priorities”. I was able to identify the system stakeholders and their win conditions and use the requirement negotiation process embedded in win-win software development model to determine mutually satisfactory set of objectives, constraints and alternatives to reconcile these win conditions, establish the system next level objectives, constraints and alternatives using my own modified version of Force-field analysis. I was able to develop a model or pattern of software development that shed away unprofessional practices among the Nigerian Software Developers and unethical pattern of usage which is mostly known to the common users.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The problem is clearly stated The importance and motivation to conduct the study is given Good justification were given in the selection of user types and also in the selection of the 5 states to be surveyed	
---	---	--