

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_113275</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Zero Trust Architecture in Cloud Networks</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. <b>It is important for computer security research community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Title is ok</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is OK however the information stated in abstract is not found in the content.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The sub-sections are OK, however the discussion is not comprehensive.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Scientifically OK, however the discussion is not comprehensive.</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. <b>A table of critical review of the literature review using thematic analysis is expected.</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b. <b>For each sub-section in the problem definition, citation is expected.</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">c. <b>Need to further elaborate the steps on qualitative research method implemented in this research.</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">d. <b>A Table of comparative analysis in section 5.7 is expected</b></p> <p>6. <b>References is not sufficient for the problem definition.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. English is OK</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In overall, the topic is interesting. However, the content is lack of comprehensive discussion related to the methodology and the result obtained.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Robiah Binti Yusof</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Teknikal Malaysia, Malaysia</b>