



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
For future concerns: The author sais that "The data harnessed from the common user shows a high percentage of common users acknowledging average performance of their software systems. This is a justification (a proof) that there is a need for such research to be carried out." This is possible because the authors allowed choosing the average performance (a comfortable option, an neutral position). In the future, the authors probably will think about this effect in the answers to the questionnaire. The authors must include more references, concerning the different subject analysed in the article: Line 39 – include a reference to "Evolutionary software development model" Line 42 – include a reference to "formal methods" Line 49 – include a reference to the article of Capper Jones Line 52 – include a reference to the article of June Verner Line 73 – include a reference to win-win spiral Line 82 – include a reference to "Force-field analysis" Line 89-91 – include references related with the different models Errors identified: Line 11 – remove the comma (after because) Line 54, 59, 109, 150, 159, 166, 172, 232– in the end include ":" (not ";", not ".") Line 55 – remove the "." Line 58 – include the "." in the end of the sentence. Line 206 – 78%? Line 230 – include a "." in the end Line 311 – inusing? or in using Line 318 – include a comma before which Line 320 - change ";" to ":" Line 365, 367 – a new paragraph? Line 555 – Gateway softwares? Line 848 – "isIntegrability" change to "is Integrability" Line 913 – "recommendthat" change to "recommend that" Line 939 – "wellirrespective" change to "well irrespective" Line 976 – "Efficiencyof" change to "Efficiency of" Line 981 – "Security/Integrityof a software system, Irecommend" change to "Security/Integrity of a software system, I recommend"	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments Sir, my reference [1] is a text-book that details all the mentioned software models in the manuscript. I decided to paraphrase the study of W.W. Royce (1970). My explanations on software models was in accordance to the study undertaken by Royce in his text-book which he titled, "Managing the Department of Large Software Systems: Concepts and Techniques" and it has been duly quoted in the manuscript Line 49 – Alright it has been quoted as instructed –Thanks for the observation. Line 73- Sir, Line 73 is a spot where win-win spiral model was calmly mentioned in the manuscript. However, the detailed explanation of win-win spiral model is sufficiently penned and quoted at line 348 of the manuscript. Line 82- Alright, it has been quoted as instructed –Thanks for the observation. (Line 89-91) – Sir, <u>risk-driven (spiral), reuse-driven, legacy-driven, demonstration-driven, design to cost or schedule</u> et.c....These are not software models but rather they are motive of design (<i>Features desired but found wanting</i>) in water-fall model. Errors identified Sir, all the identified mistakes/errors have been corrected. Some of the errors were as a result of data transfer from one storage medium to another (PC to Flash drive)