

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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it presents a novel approach to aligning business processes with SOA, offering a practical solution for improving process maturity in organizations. The integration of business processes with SOA through a middleware like an ESB provides organizations with flexibility, allowing them to reengineer processes dynamically without affecting the entire architecture. This research's contribution, particularly in the context of the education sector, introduces an innovative and cost-effective workflow solution for automated information synchronization among multiple systems, validated through simulation using YAWL. The novelty of this approach in addressing information synchronization challenges makes this manuscript an important reference for future research in SOA and process management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and conveys the primary focus of the article. However, the author could make it slightly more precise and impactful by refining the wording. Here's a revised version: "Designing a Conceptual Framework for Aligning Service-Oriented Architecture with Business Processes"	
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.	The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, as it outlines the key elements of the research, including the problem statement, the proposed solution, the validation method, and the context. However, it could briefly highlight the expected impact of the proposed framework, based on the simulation results. For example, it could mention specific improvements observed in the process after applying the framework (e.g., faster data flow, better system integration).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is logical and well-organized, ensuring a smooth flow of content. The progression from the abstract to the introduction, followed by detailed discussions on Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA), issues related to its implementation, methodology, and simulation, makes the research easy to follow and comprehensive. The breakdown of sections is thorough, particularly in the detailed exploration of SOA, with subsections like "Basic Framework" and "Enhanced Framework," which add clarity and depth. The inclusion of a review of various issues related to SOA implementation offers valuable context and background, while the "Methodology/Modeling" section effectively outlines the proposed workflow and its scope. The "Simulation" section adds practical value by demonstrating the validation of the proposed framework through YAWL, while the "Conclusions/Future Work" section highlights the forward-looking nature of the research and identifies areas for further study. To improve clarity and readability, removing "(Table 2)" from "3.3.3. Required Fields Mapping" is recommended. Additionally, grouping related topics within the "Review of Various Issues" section could streamline the content and prevent overwhelming the reader with too many subsections. Overall, the manuscript is well-structured, with only minor adjustments needed to enhance flow and consistency.	

Review Form2

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its systematic approach to aligning business processes with SOA. The conceptual framework is built on established principles of SOA, business process reengineering, and the use of middleware like ESB, which are well-recognized in the field. The technical soundness is further validated by the simulation of the proposed workflow using YAWL, which provides a clear, methodical way to test the framework's functionality. The comprehensive review of relevant issues and detailed methodology reinforce the manuscript's rigor and ensure that the proposed solution is both practical and theoretically grounded.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references listed in the manuscript are largely relevant and cover a wide range of topics, from foundational concepts in business process reengineering to the application of SOA in various domains. However, the majority of the references are somewhat outdated, with several dating back to the early 2000s and one as far back as 1993. Considering the rapid advancements in SOA, business process management, and related technologies, it would be beneficial to include more recent references to ensure that the research is informed by the latest developments. I suggest adding recent studies or reviews on SOA implementation, business process alignment, and enterprise service buses published in the last 5-10 years. This could include references to modern frameworks, cloud-based SOA implementations, and recent case studies across industries, particularly in education, as the manuscript focuses on that sector.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript presents its content in a structured and logical manner, which aids readability and comprehension. It correctly uses technical terms related to SOA and business process management, which is appropriate for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Houda Mezouar
Department, University & Country	Morocco