



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17075
Title of the Manuscript:	Abuse of Unified Modeling Language Diagrams in Software Development
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• The paper's title is not related to its content at all. The main word of it, abuse, is not addressed nor solved at the paper. • The paper acts as a poor tutorial instead of research paper that addresses a specific research problem. • It cannot be classified as a review paper. There is no comprehensive discussion to the presented cases and topics. • The Future Work and Conclusion sections are so weak and unconvincing. • The writing style of the paper is so poor, and need to be significantly enhanced. • A significant plagiarism has been found in this article. Following this links: http://agile.csc.ncsu.edu/SEMaterials/UMLOverview.pdf truncated http://uml.tools/faq/ truncated http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/rational/library/content/RationalEdge/sep04/bell/index.html truncated	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The writing style is very poor. • The paper should be proofread for typos and grammatical errors. Just as examples: - o shows the static stand-alone static view - o UML benefits software developers	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- o there is little room for misinterpretation - o standardization provides for efficient communication - o for specific, limited usages. - o Shown in figure 1 is a use case scenario on how - o The conclusion section also has many other errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Mansoura University, Egypt