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)

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	The abstract is incomplete and too brief, where the study's problems, methods, and results are not fully stated. 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. Add a new paragraph entitled Background of the study to discuss other studies/past studies/LR that support the research and confirm the contribution. **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)** 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.	
Minor REVISION comments	New Reference, at least 2019 and above If necessary, prepare a diagram for easy explanation	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Norizan Mat Diah***
Department, University & Country	***University Technology Mara Shah Alam, Malaysia***