

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129980
Title of the Manuscript:	Using TOGAF for Migration of Monolith Systems to Microservices
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In Current Research World this article will be helpful	This manuscript contains a rich analysis of how TOGAF can be harnessed as a framework for transitioning from a monolith to a microservices system. This information is very helpful to the world and offers valuable insights to the related organozations.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Yes. The title of the article is suitable and relevant to the study.
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.	No suggestions	The abstract of the article is comprehensive as required
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	Yes. The manuscript is scientifically sound. It adheres to theoretical and best-guild frameworks such as TOGAF and Agile to enhance the process of converting from monolithic systems to microservices.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	All the references used in this study are references as sufficient and recent as needed.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Sutable	The language used in the article is quite appropriate for an academic discourse. It is coherent, logical, and very research-oriented.
Optional/General comments		The manuscript offers appropriate peer-reviewed articles to back it up and contain conclusions based on sound, practical examples. Combining theoretical models, including TOGAF and Agile, with realistic migration approaches further strengthens this assertion. The systematic nature of the study on analyzing the technological transitions in the four sectors is crystal clear, which adds to the study's validity and enhances the overall credibility of the study as an academic piece. In addition, the manuscript complies with the objectives, and its explicative and practical approach confirms the work as realistic and non-derived, thus proving its academic value. The manuscript is also free of AI-generated content, and there is no sign of plagiarism; the ideas are unique, and the writing shows a solid understanding of the subject matter.

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>	There are no ethical issues associated with this manuscript.