



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
Again, the paper is still too long. Actually it is now longer. More than half can be placed in an appendix for details. The authors argued that force-field method and tool can be used to improve software quality by applying it to each of the 11 factors, measured them individually and made the bold statement that software quality is now improved as a whole. They did not discuss any relevancy to one another. They let the readers wonder how all of these relate to the three major concerns of software development: cost, time and performance. To cite an example of the poor work, note that the authors mentioned the paper of Jones (1994) and the report of Verner (2006) of a decade ago in support of background information leading to the study. How about Standish group report and many others more current studies on software failure? The literature review was poor.	Actually, software qualities are more than thirteen qualities highlighted in the manuscript. There are hundreds of qualities that could be attributed to software performance. I only picked on thirteen common ones that (I think) are accountable for indigenous software products in Nigeria. Again, Each software quality is a separate (unique) metric by which software performance could be measured. All the software qualities highlighted add up to the overall performance of a software system as a whole. Agreed that good software is measured in terms of time, cost and performance but the scope of this research is focuses on the performance metrics of software system and using force-field analysis (NOT force field method) has unarguably proofed to be successful. Yes, the studies undertaken by Peter Jones and Vener are still valid and relevant (if you read their claims) to this research. There studies are few years back but that does not discount from the fact that there claims are correct and of course it is what is presently obtainable in Nigerian software industries. Hence, there relevance to the research. <u>For instance, Newton's laws of motion were stated several decades ago but the laws are still active. The fact that the laws were stated several years ago does not render them invalid.</u> Standish group studies are not perfectly in size with the points I wanted to establish at that page of the manuscript.