

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_119235
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Software Development Processes in Cloud Computing Environments Using Agile Methodologies and DevOps Practices
Type of the Article	Original 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?</p> <p>This manuscript is a valuable addition to the scientific community. It tackles the very relevant topic of optimizing software development in cloud environments, which is a hotbed for innovation right now. The integration of Agile and DevOps practices is a cutting-edge approach, and this research provides solid, actionable insights that can genuinely help teams improve their processes. It's a piece of work that I believe many in the field will find quite interesting.</p> <p>2.Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>The title is spot on! It captures the essence of the research perfectly. However, to make it even more Accurate, you could consider a slightly shorter version: "Optimizing Software Development in Cloud Environments with Agile and DevOps Practices."</p> <p>3.Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is a great summary. It hits all the right notes, giving readers a clear idea of what the research is about, how it was conducted, and what the key findings are. It's concise yet informative, which is exactly what an abstract should be.</p> <p>4.Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>The manuscript's structure is well-thought-out. The sections flow logically, making it easy for the reader to follow the research journey. The use of figures and tables is a nice touch, as it helps to visualize the concepts and data presented.</p> <p>5.Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>From what I can see, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. The research methodology is solid, relying on empirical analysis and case studies, which lends credibility to the findings. The conclusions drawn seem to be well-supported by the data presented.</p> <p>6.Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them.</p> <p>The references are definitely up-to-date, which is great to see. However, to make the research even more robust, I'd suggest adding a couple more references that specifically delve into the latest advancements in AI integration within DevOps and perhaps some case studies on cloud-native applications. Here are a couple of suggestions:</p> <p>Rahman, M., & Roy, A. (2023). "AI-driven DevOps for Enhanced Continuous Delivery in Cloud Environments," Journal of Cloud Computing, 12(1), 45-67.</p> <p>Zhang, Y., & Wang, H. (2023). "Implementing DevOps in Multi-Cloud Environments: Challenges and Best Practices," IEEE Cloud Computing, 10(2), 98-112.</p> <p>Overall, this is a well-written manuscript that makes a valuable contribution to the field. It's clear, concise, and scientifically rigorous</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is Scholarly sound.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Harish Padmanaban
Department, University & Country	United States