

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	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is incomplete and too brief, where the study's problems, methods, and results are not fully stated.</p> <p>Introduction: Unstructured explanation/ unclear of the purpose of the study being carried out. The focus is on other studies without stating the problems encountered and why the study needs to use the suggested methods.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph entitled Background of the study to discuss other studies/past studies/LR that support the research and confirm the contribution.</p> <p>Need more deeper explanation about 2. META-TASK ,why this important in this/research and the related for this issue this research. (more citation needed)</p> <p>Which part describes the research method is "3. OVERVIEW OF LOAD-BALANCING". The research method needs to be explained one by one, entirely and clearly. Make sure the reader/researcher understands what is being done and the research contribution. This part is very unclear, whether it's the study method or not. Regardless of the research contribution, small or large, the importance of the study method should be clear, complete, and organized.</p>	<p>The problem addresses in cloud is load balancing management. This issue is more prominent in virtualization technology and it affects cloud providers or users in term of resource utilization and cost. The method used is load balancing scheme called Improved Resource Aware Scheduling Algorithm. The result was shown in section 7 of the paper.</p> <p>This research focused on improving RASA algorithm to give a better performance on load-balancing in cloud computing, and compare its performance with other existing model for load balancing. The reason for this research is towards improving the virtualization technology in cloud environment.</p> <p>This has been done both in the introduction and overview</p> <p>The concept of Meta-task is simply to transform complex processes going through multiple resources into simple lists of tasks sorted out in batches for higher throughput during scheduling computation. This concept was implemented in Linux operating system by way of using Complete Fair Queuing (CFQ) scheduler, also known as modified anticipatory scheduler. CFQ are currently in use because aside that tasks were put in batches, it also overcomes deceptive idleness [12]. Report also shows that Apache web server achieved up to 71% more throughput from using this modified anticipatory scheduler [13].</p> <p>Scheduling algorithms are with many policies but could be subdivided into immediate and batch scheduling, preemptive and non-preemptive scheduling, static and dynamic scheduling, and so on [14], [15], [16]. In Immediate mode, tasks were scheduled using First Come First Serve (FCFS) in the computing environment, while in the batch mode, tasks were grouped into a batch; which means that, a set of meta-tasks would be assigned at a mapped out time depending on the scheduler's algorithm [15]. It is the algorithm that determines how the load balancing of the resource usage for this task. In a nutshell, meta-task is a way of assigning a mapped tasks to different entities in cloud for resource provisioning</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>New Reference, at least 2019 and above</p> <p>If necessary, prepare a diagram for easy explanation</p>	<p>The References in [1],[5],[6],[7],[8],[9],[10],[17],[18],[20] are recent reviewed papers which have been included in the article.</p>
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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