

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
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

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.	DEVOP is more important if the conditions needed to its success are validated Quantitative and qualitative indicators are necessary to be verified and make a positive impact These variables changed on time that's why it is necessary to be prudent on analysis	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	good	
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.	It is more suitable to have the addition of some points on abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	acceptable	
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.	Good analysis Author used a qualitative variables statistically validated Quantitative variable must be used on future research	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	They are recent and acceptable	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	good	
Optional/General comments	Author must include a quantitative proxy and indicators to explain more the factors of a successful DEVOP AUTHOR MUST MAKE a model like $y=f(x)$ to identify and confirm the impact of variables that affect DEVOP	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Slim Chtioui
Department, University & Country	Tunisia