

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science - Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1711
Title of the Manuscript:	An ameliorated Round Robin algorithm in the cloud computing for task scheduling
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes, Researchers and practitioners in cloud computing will find this work valuable for improving resource management and system performance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The paper contains numerous grammar and language issues that need to be addressed.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	All sections of the manuscript are appropriate. These are few questions that need to be addressed. 1. What specific aspect of RR scheduling needs improvement? Is it the time quantum (TQ) length, context switches, or response time? Clearly define the gap you intend to fill. 2. Highlight the progressive TQ approach and how it addresses the identified gap. 3. Briefly mention related work (section 2) and how your proposed algorithm builds upon or diverges from previous solutions. This connection will help readers understand the context and significance of your research. 4. While you mention the objectives in the conclusion section, consider explicitly stating them earlier in the introduction. What specific goals does your proposed algorithm aim to achieve (e.g., minimizing AWT, ATT, and response time)?	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Need to make references up-to-date (References included till 2021 only). Any recent advancements in the field needs to be included for a comprehensive overview.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Navneet Kaur
Department, University & Country	Chandigarh University, India