

Review Form2

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2434
Title of the Manuscript:	Designing Conceptual Framework for Aligning Service Oriented Architecture with Business Process
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As the title mentions “Designing Conceptual Framework for Aligning Service Oriented Architecture with Business Process”, two major technology fields SOA and BPM(N), this makes this article specifically interesting for Managers, Analysts, Architects, and Developers. It refers to aligning SOA services and BPMs, which is an important topic. Should refer to refinement processes, which is today used for such operations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is meaningful, and corresponds to the article. Maybe the same title can be reformulated: “ Services Architecture and Business Processes Alignment- A Conceptual Framework”.	
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.	Needs to be reformulated and even rewritten. And extend it is too short. There is no need to mention “using web services”, because it is SOA’s main topic. And also: “validity using simulation” should be replaced with a Proof of Concept (PoC), because it is related to engineering. Reformulate “web applications” with Web and SOA based Applications. This was already mentioned a few times “The framework will help the organization to align business process of service oriented architec- ture...”,	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It has be restructured and modified. Basic and general information can be removed and replaced with references. Many Figures are put one after the other, which is not suitable. Figures should be separated with text. Avoid using paragraph sections with 1 or two lines. Simulation Result section is too short and has to be explained in detail. ...	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As already mentioned the topics is highly important. It should compare to other other avant-garde technologies: like SOA vs Microservices: Differences, Pros & Cons Datamation https://www.datamation.com/applications/microservices-vs-soa/	

Review Form2

	YAML is referred to, but is the relationship with other workflow categories? Define abbreviations before using them The whole article should restructured. Figure 7. Example of workflow in YAWL, should be modified: there is a 3 pages XML printout that should be removed. Please do include the analysis of granularity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	They are pertinent but the list is short and should add references related to: Refinement MSA and Microservices comparisons. Alignment technics. SOA libraries and products. There are many sources on the internet and use scholar references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is understandable. There is no need for major language modifications	
Optional/Generalcomments	The topics is highly important and even strategic for enterprises, but the article is fairly weak and has to be restructured and rewritten. I did not highlight parts in the article because it has to be restructured and rewritten.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment<i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antoine Trad
Department, University & Country	IBISTM, France