



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 paper is too long (over 12,000 words) with only six references. Recommend the author to observe around 5,000 words including literature review and references. The author went through great length to do the survey on common users and interviews of power users, however most results have been generally known in software quality circle and literature The analysis part which identified the potential improvement of each of the list of attributes did not offer new points that could make a difference. The recommendations were nothing new. I wonder if any practitioners see much value in spending time and effort resulting in cost to actually adopt or adapt this analysis scheme. Although I did not look for novelty, ingenuity or similar attributes in the proposed analysis and recommendations, I failed to see any real contribution of the paper in the statements made as recommendations which many are already known by software people.	Sir, the paper may appear too voluminous because it is a field research. I have tried to reduce it as moderate as possible but I realized that if I should go beyond how I have, I would end up discounting from the fact in the research. As regards the references, I only quoted the references that were substantially and truly resourceful in my research work. I should not have picked on any article that I never used. Thanks for the observation. Yes, I decided to go on a field research in order to have a first-hand report as input that would be fed into my proposed model. I never wanted to work on hypothetical assumption so that I would have a justification for each recommendation made at the completion of the research. Sir, the point is that in Nigerian Software Industries, there is a communication gap between what the users want and how the developers develop the digital devices often use by the users. 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



SDI Review Form 1.6

		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. Based on these underlying problems, recommendations were made to shed away unethical unprofessional practices frequently indulged by Nigerian software developers as well as unethical pattern of usage most often practiced by the common users.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Some English problems and some inconsistency. At times, the author used "I", other times used "we".	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 et.c). 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. <i>However, I will change it as instructed.</i>
Optional/General comments		