

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_123141
Title of the Manuscript:	Feature Engineering for Agile Requirements Management Using Semantic Analysis Strategies
Type of the Article	experimental analysis

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. This paper focus on agile projects, requirements prioritisation and management. 2.This paper used Semantic feature extraction 3. Worked on 2 datasets, PROMISE Expanded Dataset and the Coquina Dataset 4. The results obtained identified three features to have p-values below 0.05 as statistically significant, p-value = 0.0000605, p-value = 0.00000000469, and p-value = 0.0024.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggestion: Feature Engineering for Agile software Requirement's Management using Semantic Analysis	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. Abstract is focusing only on methodology adopted rather the objectives and conclusions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The main heading is following this approach 1.0,2.0,3.0.....but for section 4,the Author is missing 4.0 After section 3.4,it was expected 3.5,rather we are getting 3.6.1	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. There are many typing errors, In abstract, <i>The results obtained identified three features</i> , Author can done similar typo mistakes at many places(word are joined unnecessary). Need to go for grammar check and spelling check to find such errors. 2. In section 3.1, authors has stated that 968 instances are used, but in following text it says 969 3. Figure1 uses color, so author has given description of graph based on colors, but the final print of paper may be in black and white, so its recommended to not to use color coded description of the graph. 4. Table2 output with under column Number of Features, I think it should be 2 not 2113 5. Section 4, The text ,The results of feature extraction using the different techniques are presented in this Section., is in different font style as compared to rest of the paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not at all. All the definitions and equations used in the paper are not cited. As the equations definitions are not work of authors, proper citations are needed everywhere. So will references part will be updated automatically.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anureet Kaur
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science and Applications, Khalsa College, India