



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29644
Title of the Manuscript:	Defect Prediction Framework using Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS) for Software Enhancement Projects
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- In page 7, section 3, related literature review, the last point, Comparison of various membership functions was done by (Praynlin and Latha, 2012) and the results showed the trapezoidal membership function was better compared to other kind of membership functions, while in this research (Gaussian membership function) was used, the author need to clarify and explain the reason to do so. (Generally the membership function selection depends on data type). - In conclusion section, the second sentence, better to be (The accuracy of validation with data sets from 10 projects during requirement gathering and construction phase is 93.4 %) and no need to the other part of the sentence, because the comparison already has been done in section 5, (comparison of results).	Author: Correction made, highlighted on page 09 Author: Correction made, thanks
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Very well research and important results in this field were presented.	