

### 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	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Looks good from as per formatting point of view	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title has been already taken, Author(s) may want to different use title. One example here is "Bridging Development and Operations: A DevOps Approach"	
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.	Looks good from my end	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Looks good because there are images and/or tables are included	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Looks good	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall article is good. Below are few suggestion(s) to the Author(s): 1. Title has been already taken, Author(s) may want to use different title	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manu Mitra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bridgeport, USA</b>