Paper: **"History, Features, Challenges, and Critical Success Factors of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) in The Era of Industry 4.0"**

Corresponding Author: Md. Al-Amin

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sharad K. Soni
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 2: Julius Gathogo
University of South Africa, South Africa

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article as discussed and analysed by the authors in the body of the text.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The manuscript explains the study methods clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the manuscript appears to be clear as analysed by the authors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion appears to be accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In today's global scenario of competitive business, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) remains to be a vital information management tool for the Industry, especially medium-sized enterprises (SME). This complete software package provides a smooth flow of information across the organisations consisting of both big and small SMEs. In this context, this manuscript is a good piece of research work which demonstrates seriousness on the part of the authors to deal with the subject in addition to providing future perspective of ERP. Only one suggestion is that numbering should be omitted from the list of references.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Tittle starts with an abbreviation on Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), which is a poor show. Similarly, SMEs needs to be given in full before the author proceeds to provide abbreviations for it.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Its fine though the author doesn't have to use the word "paper" as this is not an oral presentation in a conference. He should rather call it research article or just an article. The article did not come out strong on the problem it is seeking to solve. Otherwise, it is relatively OK.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Not really save for editorial work

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Author keeps calling this research article as "paper" yet it is not an oral presentation. Why not call it article or a research article?

Study methods relatively fine

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Good job despite appearing to quote a lot without deeper analysis, otherwise its largely a good job

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusion could've done better by summarizing what the author set out to do, what he or she has achieved, and propose way forward.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

OK

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Find the above comments