



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24383
Title of the Manuscript:	Business Intelligence Readiness Issues for Higher Learning Institution (IHL): Preliminary Study and Research Model
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	- Term of data warehouse was used in text (L50). Good to define the difference of BI & data warehouse. - Term IHL and universities were used in text. Good to define what IHL in the context of this paper. - Method to record references was inconsistent in this paper refer line 47/50/85/88. Some use (author name, year), some use [xx]. Also, to ensure the right format of documenting multiple references, should it be [xx, xx] or [xx], [xx]. - Same references quoted in different ref number. [32]=[35], [4]=[12]. - Missing references, from [49] onwards. - In complete reference detail [48]. - Conflicting information: line 69: BI introduced in 1989 vs line 105 BI apps used in 1867. Which one comes first? - Line 91 BI already in use... quoted by who (author)? - Line 207 need to define what SPPBS is. - Line 208 selections of participants for qualitative approach: Form 1, 2, 5 & 6 teachers will be distributed with survey form. Why choosing teachers? Why form 1/2/5/6 only? How do teachers	Data warehouse is part of the BI component IHL is higher learning institution like universities. Done Done update Done Mandeley format BI application started 1867 but the term of BI just introduce in 1989. However I already deleted the confusing statement. Done Deleted because that is wrong sentences that come from another research. Already deleted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	related to IHL? Teachers are not teaching in IHL (in Malaysia context). - After the qualitative approach with interview with teachers, it is expected to develop the research framework. I am sceptical to leave it to the practitioners (teachers) to determine the theoretical framework. Would suggest to adopt a theoretical framework from prior researchers and modify it based on qualitative findings. - Survey forms will be used for both phases: what survey forms will be distributed? Newly developed by researcher or adapted from existing journals? - Line 237 quantitative method is considered the best approach. Why? Please justify. - Figure 2 presents a pictorial view of this research approach, there are 3 sub-objectives listed. What are the 3 sub-objectives that this paper intends to achieve? - Line 274 suggested to use SEM and SmartPLS for data analysis. Please justify why using these method. - There are lots of grammatical errors. A proof reading is needed for subsequent submission. Some obvious mistakes are: L58- it reflects, L42-it involved, l69-introducedd, L59-a prerequisite, L136-	Not relevant anymore. Mistake from another research actually. Thank you Not relevant anymore Interview the expert from BI area to get the right construct@variable for BI readiness. Done PLS used to see the relationship between construct of BI readiness. The result will display supported or NOT. This result is importance to design final BI readiness model. Done
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	such as , L139-used d , L151- are , L162-projects, L109-developed d , reflects, L187-investigated d , L189-steps, L259-will be . (characters in bold are to be added/deleted)	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- It is a good intention to define and explore a BI readiness model for IHL. However, I am not convinced that this conceptual paper has a concrete idea on how to develop a BI readiness model. - This paper displayed an organizational BI readiness BIS framework. Assuming that this is the theoretical model, what are the gaps that the researcher intends to close. Good to include it in this paper. - Would expect the researcher to discuss and compare the technical and non-technical factors used by various authors, then to define the gaps in these comparisons and present what's needed for this paper.	Next step will get more evidence of BI readiness issue from multiple authors. Ok, the gaps is how to reduce the failure rate of BI by identifying the readiness level from the beginning of BI project, Ok Thank you for the suggestion.