

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_128911
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of Service Mesh Implementations in Kubernetes For Multi-Cluster Management
Type of the 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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>This paper presents a comparative study of Istio, Linkerd, Kuma, and Consul in relation to multi-cluster Kubernetes management. The analysis centers on operational complexity, security, scalability, performance, and ease of use. The objective is to give businesses information about which service mesh best meets their requirements, regardless of whether they value sophisticated capabilities, deployment simplicity or effective multi-cluster management.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experimental setup used to explain the concepts in the paper covers a brief documentation of all key terms. The author(s) have done well in being concise and yet clear. • A comparative view of all the four tools is well presented in Table 1 and their concepts with respect to multi-cluster management in Table 2 is also clear. Overall, section 9 is the key highlight of the paper and clear and well-presented. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 4 could have been explained better. • Addition of a few real world examples in section 11 could better explain best practices 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Neha Chowdhary</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>IIT Kharagpur, India</p>