

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	

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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it offers a comprehensive analysis of network telemetry tools, introduces BPF-based innovations, and addresses key performance and scalability challenges, aiding both academic research and practical network security implementations.</p> <p>2. The title is too long and we suggest shortening it. Suggestion: Evaluating Network Telemetry Tools in Linux: Performance Metrics, Scalability, and Real-time Monitoring Insights</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Based on the provided text, the manuscript appears scientifically correct, offering accurate descriptions, balanced evaluations, and addressing real-world challenges.</p> <p>6. References are less there should be more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality is ok</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vishal Patel
Department, University & Country	USA