

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_105817
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancing Cloud Technology Security: Leveraging High-Level Coding Languages like Python and SQL for Strengthening Security Systems and Automating Top Control Processes
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. No 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. No 5. Abstract is written in a comprehensive manner. But this section some improvement regarding addition of major findings of the result. Keywords must be accurate. 6. adding more recent references is recommended	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could you make your future study more specific.. like using some algorithms etc. • Author has not given full clarity on the proposed protocol. • Showing performance analysis is not up to the mark, need to find performance analysis with appropriate parameters. 	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P. Dileep Kumar Reddy
Department, University & Country	Narsimha Reddy Engineering College, India