



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	

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 following is my review of the manuscript, "Software Quality Improvement Using Force-field Analysis". The technical components of the paper are sound and the manuscript observed that, there are two categories of users; the power users who made use of software systems to render services and the common users who are the receiving audience of the services rendered by the power users. The authors used the requirement negotiation process embedded in the win-win spiral model of software development and with the aid of force field analysis; they contend that they have been able to establish a bench-mark that forms a foundational model for every software development project. The paper makes a valuable contribution to the literature and it is of value to the readers of "BJMSC". However, the authors have NOT assembled a relevant and rigorous literature review. Although most of them are seminal, there are only six references. The paper does not demonstrate adequate understanding of the relevant literature, in terms of making a connection between Software Quality Improvement (SQI) and this paper, which is rather weak. In other words, the authors need to clearly discuss their research contributions to SQI related work. In my opinion, the authors need to adapt an established method, such as the Technology Acceptance Model and discuss some of the	Thank you very much sir, for the compliments. The related research works was not thoroughly drilled into because none of the previous researchers channelled their research objectives to alleviating the constraints or repelling forces on actualizing optimally working software systems. The views of the previous researchers as it relates to software quality improvement were explicitly stated in my "Background of Study". I also shared their views in my detailed "Statement of Problems", but I decided not to have a designated heading on their works because none of them used my style of approach at taking care of the software failures as it relates to the Nigerian context of software usability. Once again, Thanks for the great Compliments. You have really encouraged me to put more effort in my subsequent research work. Thank you very much Sir.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	proposed human computer interactions that the authors will embrace to implement their Force-field analysis. I would suggest that they investigate and try to incorporate the following reference, as well as others, that would assist them in contrasting, investigating and incorporating a similar human computer approach into their manuscript, in terms of process quality improvement and interoperability: Rodger, J. A. (2014). Reinforcing Inspiration for Technology Acceptance: Improving Memory and Software Training Results Through Neuro-Physiological Performance. Computers in Human Behavior 38 (2014) 174–184 The previously mentioned strengths of the manuscript suggest that the paper can be considered to be of high quality and also be of sufficient value to the readership of "BJMSC". Therefore, based on the foregoing discussion, I would recommend that this paper be accepted, after reviewing and integrating the basic concepts and the citation, which are referred to above and after updating their literature review.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		