

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAMCS_117751
Title of the Manuscript:	An In-depth Analysis of Performance Metrics and Comparative Assessment of Network Telemetry Tools in Linux Environments: Insights into Efficiency, Scalability, and Realtime Monitoring Capabilities
Type of the Article	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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>no the suggested title is (A Deep Analysis of Performance Metrics and Comparative Assessment of Telemetry Tools in Linux Environments)</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p> <p>These are some suggestions for the manuscript submitted for publication. Please take them into consideration to improve the manuscript and produce it in the appropriate form for academic scientific publication.</p> <p>1- The address must be changed.</p> <p>2- The abstract is very, very long. It must be rewritten and shortened to only 250 to 300 words.</p> <p>3- Keywords must be changed to semantic words only, not titles.</p> <p>4- Linguistic review of the research. There are some linguistic errors.</p> <p>5- The introduction, despite its length, does not contain any reference! References must be numbered.</p> <p>6- The research paper was not written in the correct academic format.</p> <p>7- Rewrite all paragraphs and subtitles correctly.</p> <p>8 - The magnitude of the title and the amount of work that is supposed to be present. Did the researcher only rely on 6 references?!!</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Heba Abdul-Jaleel AlAsady
Department, University & Country	Kufa University, Iraq