

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_125673
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantum Algorithms in Cloud-Based AI for Predictive Analytics of Cyber Threats to Renewable Energy Systems
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<i>While AI</i> Excerpt from the Abstract in line 4 indicate that the write failed to introduce the abbreviation AI. This action is inappropriate as abbreviation should be well introduced due to the wider audience that might have access to the article. Additionally, the abstract failed to cover the structure of the article in detail. The word abstract should encompass the totality of the writeup to give the reader a perfect and comprehensive insight of the article.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No  Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Cloud Computing for Energy System: A Skeletal Review	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is Vague and needs upgrade to capture the supposed topic. Types of quantum algorithms were not captured, Comparative analysis with the traditional means as well as being well structured	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	As stated earlier, the logical flow is not there and the weight of the manuscript is not being felt. (Too Scanty)	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Aim of an article is to bridge the gap and against such backdrop a newer premise would stand. For this article, the introduction couldn't justify the gap and as such it lacks that potency of convincing the reader that a thorough job was done. While the topic seems captivating but the content down from the abstract through the introduction seem so scanty and feeble. Regarding the correctness of the manuscript, I would say is incoherent and needs thorough upgrade.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I would say for the length of the manuscript provided, the reference is sufficient and recent.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English is readable but I say the content is way below standard for the topic.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript seems like it's a trap for reviewers. I wouldn't recommend this manuscript to be considered any further until proper research and good job/ due diligence is being done. No Figure, tables. It required a great deal of upgrade.	

### **PART 2:**

	<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)
<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>Joseph Chukwunweike</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>United Kingdom</b>