

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_73019
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Survey for Hadoop Distributed File System
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract of the paper needs to be re-written. It has to reflect the research problem, methods, key quantitative research findings and contributions in a brief way. Currently, the abstract appears like the organization summary of the paper. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% on the purpose and importance of the research (Introduction) • 25% on what you did (Methods) • 35% on what you found (Results) • 15% on the implications of the research 2. Introduction: Revise Introduction completely. The following changes should be made to the introduction: First para - overall introduction to the subject with citations to recent paper, second para - research gap that this paper is addressing, third para - how is the research question addressed in this paper (methods), fourth para - The main contributions of this paper and the originality should be highlighted in bullet form towards the conclusion of the introduction. Last para, Paper organization which is missing. The overall paper organization must be given in a separate paragraph (last para) of the introduction section. 3. Use PRISMA Flow Diagram: The flow diagram depicts the flow of information through the different phases of a systematic review. It maps out the number of records identified, included and excluded, and the reasons for exclusions [which is missing in the present study]. 4. What were the research questions that served as the article's guidelines? Include them in your article. 5. Fig. 1 not cited in the text. 6. Provide list of nomenclatures and Abbreviations. 7. Conclusion must be improved! your conclusion should assist the reader in comprehending why your study should be of interest to them after they have completed reading the article. A conclusion is not just a reiteration of your main arguments or a restatement of your research issue; rather, it is a synthesis of important points and ideas. 8. Language (English) corrections are required and should be proofread by a native speaker 	
Minor REVISION comments	Authors must revise the manuscript and check the entire manuscript for typos, spelling mistakes and grammatical errors. For example, see page 5, The user groupes or the user groups, etc.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Asif Irshad Khan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia</i>