

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_125615
Title of the Manuscript:	CI/CD and Automation in DevOps Engineering
Type of the Article	

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.	This manuscript discusses highly relevant topics like CI/CD automation, which are crucial for modern software development. The integration of CI/CD into DevOps enhances productivity, software quality, and time-to-market, making this article valuable for engineers, researchers, and industry professionals. It provides a strong foundational understanding, especially for newcomers to CI/CD.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<u>The current title is appropriate, but adding a mention of “tools and best practices” might make it more aligned with the manuscript’s focus. Suggested alternative: "CI/CD Automation in DevOps Engineering: Tools, Practices, and Security Considerations."</u>	
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.	<u>The abstract covers the overall aim of the manuscript well but should include a brief mention of the tools discussed (e.g., Jenkins, GitLab CI/CD). Including this will provide a clearer overview of the manuscript’s breadth.</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>The structure is well-organized, but some sections could be further divided for better readability. For example, separating the security aspects of CI/CD automation into its own subsection might help emphasize its importance.</u>	
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.	<u>The manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting well-established principles of CI/CD. It effectively explains the benefits of continuous integration and continuous delivery, supported by practical examples and tool analyses. The technical discussions around pipeline implementation and automation are well-detailed and grounded in research, making the article both technically sound and practical for industry application.</u>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<u>The references are recent and appropriate but could benefit from a few more citations related to security challenges in CI/CD pipelines. You may consider adding more references focused on CI/CD security practices in modern DevOps environments.</u>	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear but could be refined in some sections to improve readability. For example, in the abstract, ensure proper punctuation and sentence flow, particularly in the section discussing automated testing and deployment processes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript covers the topic of CI/CD in DevOps comprehensively. While the technical content is strong, additional focus on case studies or real-world implementations of CI/CD pipelines in large organizations could provide further practical insights for the readers.	

Review Form 3

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yash Jani
Department, University & Country	USA