

Review Article
The Art of B2B Integration
A Study of the State of the Art:
B2B integration Patterns, Components, and Architecture

I would not recommend publishing it until these authors or this author does some radical surgery, eliminating redundancy, and identifying concepts, applying this program to some real world setting. The audience for which he seems to be writing is minuscule and when he and his article by pointing out multiple problem areas without really addressing them, I cannot in good conscience recommend the work be published. Particularly in the science and technology areas it should be expected that author's apply what they are offering to real-world situations and this author has not done that. His grammatical writing skills are subpar. At best, I could say it seems obvious he has spent time developing this article, but he has not edited his work, he has not adequately analyzed his work. Moreover, he has not applied nor synthesized his ideas, nor has he considered the need for logical transitions from one sentence to the next, one paragraph to the next, and one section to the next. His sense of organization overall is lacking.

For 17 pages, the author sings the praises of B2B Integration and then he comes up with a list of problem areas yet he offers no indication any of these problems can be overcome. He says human beings can be removed from the equation and then notes that at times they will be necessary regarding the decision making process. Immediately preceding the conclusion the author says in a real-world enterprise there can be tens, hundreds, or even thousands of subsystems in every layer of the complex architecture inherent in B2B, and this will be a challenge for administrators. Even administrators want something that is user friendly, some kind of a program for which the learning curve is not so steep that it becomes cost prohibitive. Then the author tells me that data can be lost if the rules are too weak and communication may not be established if the rules may be too strong. Now I am seriously asking myself why did I need to read 17 pages before reaching these problem areas and should I even consider adopting B2C. The author in line 509-514 lists of four strategies that can be used in B2B Integration but he doesn't discuss, he just lists. Until he can show me how he can overcome the limitations of B2B Integration, I can only conclude that this article should not be published until the author carries out some major revisions including rewriting most sections.

The following includes just some of the comments I have made regarding clarity and accuracy of this work.

Page 1

My first comment is that the Abstract offered tells the reader nothing with regard to a thesis statement. An abstract should also contain only a single paragraph.

Line 6: this should read in the lead, not on the lead and to what processes is the author referring here.

In Line 7 the author spells the term organizations correctly and from there on it is spelled incorrectly.

Line 7 contains an incomplete sentence. The author writes thus developing a – then the author quits so I have no idea what is being developed.

Line 8: the growth and change of software technology is rapidly developing, requiring software systems to be in constant upgrade mode so as to provide – and there the author loses me. That is,

- What is an enhanced integrated solution to a changing world?
- The author writes meaning and developing an approach to collaboration, communication, resource sharing, optimization, profitability, and efficiency.
 - Are those the objectives of B2B? IF so, then say so.
 - My questions are collaboration with whom,
 - Sharing of what kinds of resources?
 - Optimization of what? Profitability and efficiency?

The author may know what he's talking about but the reader does not.

Line 10: often, we have heard of integrated solutions. Who are we? Are you referring to yourself as the author or do you have a co-author? Are you referring to IT people within organizations, the rank and file, CEOs, those to whom the work has been outsourced, i.e., partners, everybody? Other? You must be clear.

Line 13:the author talks about the need for integration tools and applications. My response is that these tools and applications already exist. My students have been using Google.docs, I have colleagues using Zoom, PC Anywhere has been around for at least 25 years, Microsoft Office has programs that interact, Clouds are available so that anyone regardless of where he is located geographically can readily have access to any kind of document. The author then goes on to talk about the integration of heterogeneous data sources among different applications and I have no idea what that means because the author has not told me what a homogeneous data source is. I would suggest this article is written for a very small audience of experts and the reason that I comment on this is because everything is written at such a high level of abstraction that much of it has virtually no meaning to anyone who might contemplate the possibility of adopting what appears to be a software program but I cannot even tell if that's what it is.

Line 20: again you have one assertion here which appears as a one sentence paragraph and there is no such thing. First sentence in any paragraph is the topic sentence. Other sentences in that ¶ should follow logically from the topic sentence. The last sentence in the ¶ should lead logically to the first sentence in the next ¶. This rule of writing is applied whether you are looking at transitions from one ¶ to the next or from one section in your article to the next. Your ideas should flow logically throughout the article.

Lines 21-23& 24 on Page 2: this should read... and competitive advantages extend beyond enterprise boundaries and therefore focus on relationships with many partners. Are you referring to organizational boundaries and if so are you using enterprise an organization interchangeably or something else? You need to be consistent. This is why defined concepts is so important. You go on to write that "The business landscape is changed and rapidly changing [clarify this assertion] Mass. This affects the way organization conducts business with its partners. It also affects internal management processes and my question is what processes?

Page 1 continued

Line 25: collaborative e-commerce is the current wave of what? It requires the dynamic creation and management of both inter and intra-relationships, particularly those that affect business partners.

Lines 26-30: trading relationships with partners, the public and private business processes automation, increase adaptability and increased flexibility through an integration middleware and I have no idea what the author is talking about here. Business processes are affected by other processes – such as what? And need for interoperability – which is what? When systems integrate processes are affected – that seems rhetorical but I still have no idea to what processes you are referring here. Service delivery must change and thus entire planning formula has to be integrated as well. Not only do I not know what you are trying to tell the reader I am beginning to wonder when the focus will be on B2B because it should have been in the Abstract and it was not.

Line 31: you write that integration is the integration – you need to find an editor, preferably a professional ed. because what you are writing about here makes no sense whatsoever unless, that is, you are writing for a very small IT audience but even then, when you do not define or apply concepts, you are going to lose the reader and that reader will stop reading.

Lines 31-34: using software to communicate beyond the organization does not increase the size of that organization. It enhances the degree to which that organization can communicate with others with whom it is partnering.

Line 34: how are you planning to enhance the exchange of data, unify software components and streamline business processes. You are telling me that this B2B integration can do this but you do not tell me how B2B will accomplish this.

Lines 36-40: should aim for real-time application to application, assistant to system interaction? How about it must, not should and extant software is already doing this. You need to tell me how this program is better than extant software or you have, on page 2, already lost me as a potential customer.

Line 43: sharing of information was difficult a decade ago but it is no longer. You talk about traditionally you have only 3 references dating back further than 2003.

Page 3

Lines 53+ you already said this on page 2. Why revisit it just a single page later?

Line 59: this should read Wong focuses on... Do they extend through various businesses or do they simply reach or interact or interface with partners. Earlier you are talking about partnerships and now you are changing your focus to a generic various businesses. Is there any reason why?

Line 61: an information resource is an object or a service that can handle processes or produced data in a way that involves communication with external information resources. That says nothing. You are defining a term using the term and that's illegitimate tautological reasoning.

Page 3 continued

Lines 63-65: when information resources work together [what about are synthesized] either on a network, or like objects within application, integration is achieved. The second phrase in the sentence

particularly when the author writes this is definition cuts across all levels of integration. This is the first time the author has referred to levels of integration. What does this mean?

The author has a section titled Integration Technologies and then a list of 12 concepts, none of which has been defined and there was no discussion of their relevance. My question is why is that list even included?

Page 4

Lines 88-84: concepts and need to be defined include systems, solutions, external and internal integration, integration techniques, sustainability, flexibility, categorization of what, platform, component, application, processes, and finally, B2B integration. It looks as if the author could have with line 82 but only after the author discusses what these concepts mean. Unless the authors can demonstrate to the reader how the application of this program works. It does not matter whether you are talking about social policies or mathematics or physics or software technology, you need to show the reader how you can apply what you have so that it makes sense to someone who might want to consider adopting it. When the author tells me that component of integration is the development of data integration the author is telling absolutely nothing and when he adds whereby several network features including load balance, session management, fault protection and security are added to the product. Then in line 103 talks about making it easy to add new logic and I have no idea what old logic is.

Page 6

Lines 132-134: process integration uses a graphical modeling interface above an integration server connecting all the applications. What do you mean by above an integration server?

Page 9

Much of what follows is in bullet point format rather than paragraph format. I don't understand why the author is not simply discussing these instead of placing headings in front of every paragraph.

My recommendation is that this author needs to tighten up and shorten this article and you need to do so beginning with his Abstract or he needs to define his thesis statement. If I writing for an audience within my own discipline, I need to define my concepts and I need to apply that theoretical definition in a way that allows the use or/the reader to clearly understand how that concept as applied. The word integration appears more times than I can count but the author never really tells me what it is that he's integrating he talks about security he talks about efficiency and effectiveness, processes which he never identifies, but he never really tells me how that's going to be possible using this particular piece of software. I want to know why hould consider adopting the software. I want to know what is in it for me why should I as a possible client care about changing what I'm currently using?