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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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.** | A thorough comparison of the three leading cloud service providers—AWS, Microsoft Azure, and Google Cloud Platform—makes this book useful to the scientific and technological communities. It assists researchers, decision-makers, and IT professionals in assessing the appropriateness of cloud services according to factors including cost, functionality, and strategic value. A comprehensive picture of the state of cloud computing today is given by the paper, which closes the gap between technical service offers and commercial developments. Additionally, it provides practical relevance by including cost structures and real-world examples, which supports company planning as well as academic research. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | A Comparative Analysis of AWS Core Services: Strategic Positioning, Market Leadership, and Pricing Models Relative to Azure and Google Cloud" is a current title that is generally appropriate and instructive. It may, however, use a little polishing for academic conciseness and clarity because it is very long.  It is good to write full form of ASW in the title.  **Suggested Alternative Title: *“Comparative Analysis of Amazon Web Services (AWS), Azure, and Google Cloud: Core Services, Market Strategy, and Pricing Models”*** |  |
| 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. | Although the abstract gives a broad summary of the goals and conclusions of the research, it is not very clear or explicit. Here are three important recommendations:   * To give the abstract a more scholarly feel, it could briefly discuss the comparative approach (such as price analysis, service benchmarking, and market trend monitoring). * There are a number of grammatical errors and strange expressions, such as "in the region of the cloud services," "the same reason," etc. The impact and readability would be enhanced by a more formal and succinct tone. * Although the abstract highlights AWS's leadership, it would be helpful to include a final phrase that summarizes the main conclusions drawn from the comparison, such as the situations in which each provider performs best. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Overall, the paper shows a solid grasp of cloud service infrastructures and takes a comparison approach that is scientifically valid. It provides precise technical explanations of AWS, Azure, and GCP services. The report does not include citations for several performance assertions (such as pricing trends and global coverage statistics), which are essential for scientific rigor even though the data and comparisons are generally accurate. Credibility would be increased by using more precise performance measures or benchmarks. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The manuscript includes a sufficient number of references, many of which are recent (2023–2025), making it timely and relevant. It draws from reputable journals and conferences. However, the following suggestions could strengthen the reference section:   * Include more peer-reviewed sources that provide performance benchmarks or industry adoption statistics. * Add references from Gartner, IDC, or Forrester reports for validated market positioning data. * Ensure unique references: Some citations are repeated (e.g., Kaushik et al., 2021 appears twice); this should be cleaned up. * The absence of in-text citations throughout the main body significantly weakens its academic validity, and the authors are strongly advised to incorporate proper citation formatting to support their claims and data. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | * Awkward wording, repetition, or grammatical faults can be found in a number of parts (e.g., “in the same reason,” “services being provided to the organization”). To enhance the lucidity and academic tone, they should be fixed. * The document occasionally alternates between informal and formal terminology, such as "optimal utility" and "best use," which ought to be standardized. * A few paragraphs, particularly those in the introduction and abstract, are unclear in their topic sentences and focus. Readability would be much improved with a more organized flow with appropriate transitions. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The paper offers a useful comparison of the top cloud computing platforms, emphasizing AWS's tactical advantages. For audiences in academia and business, it is instructive and pertinent. To increase its academic quality, it is necessary to make changes to its organization, linguistic clarity, and citation procedures. It has a good chance of being published after changes. |  |
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