

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_77722
Title of the Manuscript:	AN IMPROVED RASA FOR LOAD-BALANCING IN CLOUD COMPUTING
Type of the Article	Research

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Author is advised to clearly explain the Flow chart in Fig 10. As per the results in Table 5 the proposed algorithm is having flow time more than the RASA. Suggest how to reduce the flow time in future work.	The flowchart processing was shown in Fig 10. A procedure is created which performs the work of sorting based on execution time of each cloudlets (tasks) and completion time of each virtual machine installed on the host. Once the procedure (function/module) is called, the highlighted steps were executed and a test is done to know if more task remains. If Yes, the procedure recalled. In other words, the procedural flowchart symbol used here is a recursive one which keeps recalling itself as long as the meta-task is not empty.  The proposed algorithm is however, having flow time more than the RASA, further research can be done on this in the future

**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)	