SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2015_BJAST_17592**
Title of the Manuscript:	**THE ART OF B2B INTEGRATION (A STUDY OF THE STATE OF ART B2B INTEGRATION PATTERNS, COMPONENTS AND ARCHITECTURES)**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**In my opinion, the paper is quite well written and as a survey paper can be published in BJAST. However, there should be corrected the following mistakes/errors:** - **the second sentence of the abstract is not finished** - **Line 12: the sentence should be rewritten in a more readable form** - **references should be correct: eg. system(Laudon&Traver, 2013) => systems (Laudon & Traver, 2013)** - **Line 66: The enumerated list should be commented – why these features are listed here?** - **Line 84 – the sentence is not finished** - **Line 86 – is the solutions => is a solution** - **Line 126- the must => they must** - **Line 127- exists => exist** - **The authors should put the references to the figures placed in the text like "see Fig. 1" etc.** - **Line 135- application => applications** - **The authors claim that they write a survey paper but the almost always they cite the Samtani, Healey & Samtani, 2002 work. They should refer to other works more. Now it looks like a discussion on one scientific paper.** - **Line 234- unnecessary repetition.** - **Line 264- is extremely => exptremely**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	- **Line 269- f => if** - **Line 296- businesses requires => businesses require** - **Line 309- his type=> its type** - **Line 323- goals is => goal is** - **Line 354 – irrespective => irrespectively** - **Line 367- number business => number of business** - **Line 370- increase => increases** - **Line 449- hosed=> hosted** - **Line 495 and close to it – the text is not formatted correctly** - **The conclusion section should be rewritten again – now it looks strange** - **Line 529 is unnecessary** - **Line 530 – u.a. can be deleted** - **Lines 533 & 534 – the press should be placed**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland**