

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_99436
Title of the Manuscript:	Security Concerns and Solutions for Enterprise Cloud Computing Applications
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The paper is kind of general and intended to be read by general public and not professionals. But it helps as a starting point for the scientific community.' 2. yes 3. yes 4. yes 5. yes 6. References are not recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. yes	
Optional/General comments	The paper is kind of general and intended to be read by general public and not professionals. It misses lot of real examples of data breaches, data losses events, real attacks... Lot of ideas are stated without being referenced. The key management technique for encryption and protection of data breaches is not explained. The existing approach for key management should be explained and contrasted! Various data loss prevention (DLP) strategies have been developed in research and academic circles. But none of them was presented or explained! Such strategies should be at least be mentioned, referenced and compared! What are the available tools/approached that can be used to evaluate the API's security? What are the limitations of "internal cloud" as an alternative to the public cloud? Section 3, "implementing cloud security" is simply duplicating the content of the previous section without any difference. This section should highlight more technical aspects.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khouloud Samrouth
Department, University & Country	Arab Open University, Lebanon