



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	This paper discusses several dimension of BI implementations inside organizations, which include CSF and organization readiness. The paper is profiled as a literature review paper and sheds some light on what has been discussed in literature. However, there are several problems with this research. The research doesn't look like a literature review article, it looks more as a work in progress on research plan. If the authors want to have this paper as a literature review paper, then they should have a clear research methodology that explains which research has been chosen, why, from where, and what is the time period they focused on. I would suggest to follow the guidelines for systematic LR provided by this seminal paper "Webster, Jane, and Richard T. Watson. "Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a." MIS quarterly 26, no. 2 (2002): 13-23." You can also see an example of a systematic literature review paper here Haddara, Moutaz, and Ondrej Zach. "ERP systems in SMEs: A literature review." In System Sciences (HICSS), 2011 44th Hawaii International Conference on, pp. 1-10. IEEE, 2011.	This paper is not fully systematic review paper that need the right method as suggest by the reviewer. This paper is close to research planning with reference from multiple authors. Maybe the right category is "Study Protocol" or "Short Research Article" However thank you for the comment.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	It is also important to discuss why the authors focus on IHL and does the reviewed literature tackle the same domain? Why is this domain is important? What is the difference between this domain's intelligence needs and other type of organizations? I would also recommend the exclusion of the your research and data collection plan as they are irrelevant for a literature review paper. There are several grammatical mistakes and typos in the whole paper, so I advise you to proof read it.	The focus area is higher learning institution, but the finding could generalize for other type of organization. The reason of IHL is important because this research needs to identify the readiness of BI at the beginning stage because BI cost a lot of money. So that, higher learning institution with the budget constraint can be ready before implementing the BI system. Ok.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Extensive proof reading is needed	Ok