

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_107646
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Cloud Service Brokers: Enhancing Security and Compliance in Multi-cloud Environments
Type of the Article	Research Paper

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maybe. 2. Yes. 3. No. 4. Yes. 5. Most. 6. Yes. <p>Additional Comments: The paper aims to discuss an important and timely topic about the role of cloud service brokers in enhancing security and compliance in multi-cloud environments. However, the manuscript needs a major revision for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract mentions the focus on encryption key management strategies and IAM solutions, but the body seems to deviate into several directions, including compliance, regulatory frameworks, and risk assessments. The scope needs to be more tightly focused or expanded to adequately cover all these topics. 2. The paper mentions that there is a considerable body of literature on security and privacy in cloud computing but doesn't adequately review or cite this literature to build its argument. This leaves the reader questioning the originality and contribution of the work. 3. The paper meanders through multiple subjects like role-based access control, regulations, compliance, and even business growth rates. The narrative needs to be streamlined for better coherence. 4. The paper falls short in providing deep technical insights into how cloud service brokers can specifically enhance security and compliance. More technical examples and perhaps even a case study could provide a stronger, more convincing argument. 5. The paper mentions an RA (Risk Assessment) and a CSRA (Cloud Security Risk Assessment), but it lacks a clear explanation or evaluation of these methods. A detailed methodology section is missing, making it difficult to assess the reliability and validity of the findings. 6. The conclusions should provide a summary of the key findings and contributions of the paper. However, they are mostly a recapitulation of the existing issues with compliance and security in cloud computing. 7. The manuscript could benefit from a language polish to make it more precise and academically rigorous. There are several instances of verbose sentences and unclear phrasing that dilute the paper's impact. 8. While the paper focuses primarily on regulations within the United States, a discussion on the global implications would provide a more rounded perspective. <p>I recommend a major revision to address these issues. After these significant revisions, the paper could potentially provide valuable insights into the role of cloud service brokers in enhancing security and compliance in multi-cloud environments</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly 	<p>No.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Xingsi Xue
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science and Mathematics, Fujian University of Technology, China