

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124288
Title of the Manuscript:	DevOps Implementation: Bridging the Gap Between Development and Operations
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	By analyzing both technical tools and organizational challenges, the manuscript bridges the gap between theory and practice, offering actionable insights that can aid industries in improving workflow efficiency and collaboration. I appreciate the manuscript's balance between practical case studies and statistical support, making it highly relevant for both researchers and practitioners. However, I believe that a more detailed exploration of the specific tools and challenges would further enhance its value to the community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is clear and relevant, but it could be more specific to reflect the focus on tools, best practices, and challenges. A possible alternative title could be: <i>"DevOps Implementation: Tools, Best Practices, and Overcoming Challenges for Seamless Development and Operations Integration."</i>	
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.	Clarify the Methodology; Highlight Key Tools and Strategies; Addressing the Challenges also Add "Organizations that invested in automation tools like Jenkins, Docker, and Kubernetes saw gains in efficiency and workflow, while the study identifies strategies such as leadership commitment and training to address cultural resistance."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes it is satisfactory	
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 manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive analysis of both primary and secondary data, combining expert interviews with case studies and industry reports. The research methodology is well-structured, using qualitative data to derive insights into DevOps implementation across various industries, which enhances its credibility. The findings, such as the correlation between cultural change initiatives and successful DevOps implementation (R = 0.85), are supported by empirical evidence and relevant tools like Jenkins and Docker, showcasing the technical validity of the study. Furthermore, the discussion on challenges and best practices provides actionable recommendations grounded in real-world scenarios, strengthening the manuscript's practical relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Needs more recent reference	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Abhay Kumar Yadav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>USICT, India</b>