

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 Article

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> <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. I found this study interesting and relevant in the field. I believe that the author has adequate understanding and knowledge of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p> <p>2. This manuscript title is suitable, quite clear and very interesting, but ideally a good title is one that has/shows: [a] topical substance, [b] research context, [c] describing research methods, [d] value & originality.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite good and has been equipped with a. the purpose of the research conducted, b. The research method used, c. The main findings or results of the research, d. Originality and value of the research conducted, e. Implications of the studies conducted.</p> <p>4. I think the subsections and structure of the manuscript are <i>very good</i> and <i>appropriate</i>. My suggestion is that the conclusion should be made into a separate chapter (Chapter 6).</p> <p>5. This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, Methodology, have all been well and clearly stated. The methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, but the significant findings have not been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Textbooks, Journals and Proceedings (Conference Article), Websites and Standards, with the number is sufficient (61 references).</p> <p>SPECIAL COMMENT This manuscript has been well written following the way of writing a Research Article. Research objectives, Hypotheses, Justification of the Study, Scope of the Study, Methodology, have all been well and clearly stated. The methods used in solving the problem, the significance and urgency of the problem under study, but the significant findings have not been explained explicitly and clearly. I think this manuscript is scientifically correct. Analysis and discussion are also presented sequentially and well structured, but are not detailed and not comprehensive. In the Results and Discussion section <i>should not only mention</i> about the results obtained, but also discuss key findings, claims, limitations of the study, etc. Your key findings should be written in this section and discussed in depth and comprehensively based on reputable and sufficient references. My suggestion is that the conclusion should be made into a <i>separate chapter</i> (in this case it is Chapter 6). All references have been cited properly and correctly, and these references are dominated by Textbooks, Journals and Proceedings (Conference Article), Websites and Standards. The number is sufficient (61 references). Kindly..., reference would be best to cite the related statement. I suggest that the author writes suggestions for further research and acknowledgments to related parties at the end of the manuscript. I believe that the author has <i>adequate understanding and knowledge</i> of the issues covered in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good enough</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Accept with Minor 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:	Yusuf Suryo Utomo
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Energy Conversion and Conservation, Indonesia