



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_43819
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction method for classification of software engineering projects performance in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	Over half of this paper presents data in tables and figures, which means that the explanations of experimental results are insufficient. The paper should present more details about the analysis of the experimental results.	
Minor REVISION comments	In the Abstract section (Lines 13 and 14), what is "developed model"? I cannot find the answer from this paper	
Optional/General comments	The paper presented a prediction method for classification of software engineering projects performance in Nigeria. The predication method of engineering projects has been described and the feasibility of the prediction has been demonstrated with a case study. However, I could not see how the prediction method was better than to giving the characteristics of projects as failure, challenged and successful. The authors claimed that other developed model cannot improve without increasing the cost and time, but this study and developed model does. Then I would like to see some sound proof or concrete data to support the claim.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. Karnavel
Department, University & Country	Anand Institute of Higher Technology, Anna University, India