



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I understand this is a field research. If this is a report internally to an institution, so be it. But the length and other attributes of the paper offer not much new information. The author should take a look at other field research papers published in numerous journals. No one would want to read a journal paper of this length even if the content might offer something. Literature review is poor. Furthermore I am not convinced the individual analysis of each of the 13 attributes to quality and the simple combined calculation result proves anything to researchers and professionals in software quality discipline.	Sir, I don't really get your point whether the paper is too voluminous or scanty. <u>Talking about my contribution to knowledge (or offering something new..).</u> "I have taken my time to look at other research works in line with software quality improvement, I have not seen an author who incorporated concepts of another discipline (force-field analysis) other than computing to trade the balance between supporting forces/restraining forces (constraints) to developing an optimal software system, using mathematical notation to explicitly analyse the performance analysis of force-field on each software quality and deriving the overall quality improvement (QI) achievable using force-field analysis" However, I will still browse to check other recent research works in this line of interest to really know what you are talking about. "Thanks for the remarks"