

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_105439
Title of the Manuscript:	Unleashing the Power of Cloud Computing for Big Data Management: Advantages, Challenges, and Future Prospects
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Partially</p> <p>Good</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Partially</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>The authors have done a good job on the Classification of Human Protein, but this paper still needs improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is too large, so reduce it to 180 - 200 words if possible. A review paper abstract should always mention and compare the efficacy/efficiency percentage rate for the reader's quick overview. The abstract should at least have a line or two about the need for this work. This abstract has an intro and it straightaway deals with the proposed work. Apart from giving the literature in paragraphs, better to add a table which precisely shows the proposed method, pros and cons. The mentioned cloud computing pro and cons table is not specific. No need of generalised tables and hence remove it At the end of the introduction section, there should be 'Paper Structure / Paper Organization'. The difference between the present review and previous review should be highlighted. Add more of the issues and what is the significance of this research. The paper lacks a convincing review of previous theoretical frameworks, which is necessary to be considered for any review paper publication. Discussing about cloud challenges and not even including the working architecture of the 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>cloud is unacceptable.</p> <p>9. The use of more cloud parametric comparisons by the authors is recommended.</p> <p>10. Another major issue of this paper is Missing implementation details. The authors haven't mentioned anything about the tool used to build/implement cloud for big data management. Then they should compare the cloud software with one another mentioning the pros and cons. That's what the purpose of a review paper.</p> <p>11. The number of references (23) is not at all enough for a review paper. It should be significantly increased and more in-depth survey should be done. I suggest adding and citing the following cloud-related papers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An artificial intelligence lightweight blockchain security model for security and privacy in IIoT systems. J Cloud Comp,(2023), pp.12-38• https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/7754765• https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21385-4_33• https://doi.org/10.1186/s13677-022-00351-0• https://doi.org/10.1186/s13677-023-00449-z• https://doi.org/10.3390/s22197169 <p>12. Unfortunately, the language and sentence structures of this manuscript are at times incomprehensible. The paper needs rewriting and thorough language editing to allow for a proper peer review.</p> <p>13. More than all, the paper structure looks so amateurish. Alignment is not even justified and authors use left alignment which is a basic article writing principle. Subsections are also not appropriate.</p> <p>14. A separate section for Limitations of this review and possible future works in detail would give further ideas for the readers who wish to enhance your work.</p>	
--	--	--

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Shitharth Selvarajan
Department, University & Country	Kebri Dehar University, Ethiopia