

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	Research 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>

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.	This manuscript addresses a timely and important topic: the migration of monolithic systems to microservices, a critical transformation for enterprises adopting modern technological practices. By utilizing the TOGAF framework, the paper provides structured guidance on managing this transition, which is a significant contribution for both researchers and practitioners in enterprise architecture and software development. The integration of Agile methodologies further enhances its practical relevance. This research could guide organizations in achieving scalable, agile, and efficient systems while mitigating risks, thus having substantial value for the scientific and industrial communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and accurately reflects the content of the paper. No changes are required.	
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.	The abstract is well-written, summarizing the key aspects of the study, including the role of TOGAF's ADM in facilitating migration, integration with Agile, and the benefits and risks of transitioning to microservices. However, it could benefit from the inclusion of specific examples or metrics mentioned in the manuscript, such as scalability improvements or case study insights, to make it more impactful. Add specific examples or results to strengthen the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It comprehensively explains the challenges of monolithic systems, the benefits of microservices, and how TOGAF's structured approach facilitates migration. The integration of Agile methodologies is well-justified, and the mapping of TOGAF's phases to migration activities demonstrates practical applicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and well-cited throughout the manuscript. However, a few recent studies on microservices governance and risk management frameworks could enhance the literature review.	

Review Form 3

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Solberg, E. (2022). "The transition from monolithic architecture to microservice architecture: A case study." Hedenäs Bennet, O., & Jyborn, A. (2024). "The Data Management of a Microservices Migration of Embedded Software." M. K. Bagwani and G. K. Shrivastava (2024), Performance Comparison of REST API and GraphQL in a Microservices Architecture, International Conference on Data Science, Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning, 409. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written and free of significant grammatical errors. The language is suitable for scholarly communication. Minor proofreading could enhance clarity and flow.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into a complex subject and maintains a good balance between theoretical and practical aspects. A few areas for improvement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating visuals or diagrams to simplify the explanation of TOGAF phases and their mapping to migration activities. Expanding on the practical case study example to give readers a more tangible understanding of the process. Including a dedicated section on potential future research directions. <p>No plagiarism is suspected. The manuscript appears original based on its content and citations.</p> <p>No competing interest issues were observed.</p> <p>No ethical issues were identified in this manuscript.</p> <p>This manuscript provides a structured approach to a complex and critical topic. With minor revisions to enhance clarity, comprehensiveness, and practical applicability, it has the potential to be a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahesh Kumar Bagwani
Department, University & Country	RGPV, India