

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_108670
Title of the Manuscript:	Big Data in Information Systems
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The topic of the article is relevant given the constant growth of the amount of data necessary for making effective management decisions. Therefore, developing tools for processing big data, including as part of information systems, is an urgent task. However, the presented research does not fully correspond to the specified topic; it has signs of superficiality, which limits the reader's interest in the article.</p> <p>2. The article's title does not fully correspond to its content, as it is difficult to call the conducted research systematic. The presented materials correspond more to an overview lecture on big data and information systems than scientific research.</p> <p>3. The abstract doesn't correspond to the article's content because it doesn't contain any results obtained by the author(s).</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript don't correspond to the scientific paper's requirements. In particular, there are no sections with an overview of previously conducted studies. There are no presented results of the author's research and their discussions. The conclusions are too blurred, which makes it challenging to identify the primary author's emphasis. The structure proposed by the authors is too detailed; most subsections of the last level of the hierarchy contain only one sentence.</p> <p>5. There is no precise formulation of the goal and objectives of the research. This makes it difficult to understand the results obtained by the authors and their scientific significance. The article mainly contains an overview of the already-known provisions regarding information systems and big data processing. At the same time, the relationship between these components in the article's title context is not traced.</p> <p>6. The given list of used sources in the Section "References" is too short, considering the stated research topic. It should be expanded by including relevant sources published in the last 3-5 years. It is also recommended to allocate a separate section like "Literature Review."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article requires careful revision</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Pavlo Hryhoruk
Department, University & Country	Khmelnyskyi National University, Ukraine