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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 tackles the critical challenge of migrating monolithic systems to microservices using the TOGAF framework. It is highly relevant as organizations increasingly adopt microservices for scalability and flexibility. By bridging theory and practical application, the research offers valuable insights and guidance on overcoming the complexities of this migration, benefiting both academic and industry communities.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title "Using TOGAF for Migration of Monolith Systems to Microservices" is generally clear but could be more concise. It also lacks specificity regarding the focus on the benefits or challenges of migration. Suggested alternative: Leveraging TOGAF Framework for Efficient Migration from Monolithic to Microservices Architecture**	
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 too general and lacks detail. It should briefly mention the methodology, challenges in migrating monolithic systems, and key outcomes of applying TOGAF. Suggestions:** **1. Include a mention of the methodology or case studies.** **2. Highlight challenges and how TOGAF addresses them.** **3. Summarize the expected results of the migration.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**The manuscript presents a clear methodology using TOGAF for migrating monolith systems to microservices. However, some sections lack depth in explaining the benefits and potential challenges. Additionally, more concrete examples or case studies would strengthen the scientific foundation. Ensure accuracy in terminology and proper citations throughout.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The references in the manuscript are generally adequate but could benefit from a more recent set of sources to reflect current trends and advancements in microservices architecture and TOGAF adoption. Consider adding references from high-impact journals or conferences from the past 2-3 years to ensure the manuscript aligns with the latest research. Specifically, articles focusing on the real-world application of TOGAF in cloud-native environments and recent studies on the challenges of microservices migration would be valuable.**	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**The language is understandable but lacks clarity and conciseness. It requires revision to improve precision, eliminate redundancy, and enhance the academic tone for scholarly communication.**	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**M. Bhuvaneswari**
Department, University & Country	**Jayaprakash Narayan College of Engineering, India**