

Peer Review

Review of: "Building Foods Data Automation Platform Using Cloud Computing Type PaaS"

Adeyemi Adegoke Adeleke¹

1. Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University - College Station, United States

1. Summary and Scope

This manuscript presents a cloud-based data automation platform called *Cloud dataMaPo* for collecting and integrating food price and availability data across multiple websites using PaaS cloud infrastructure. The study touches on cloud computing architecture, real-time databases, and web scraping techniques. While the topic is relevant and timely, particularly for urban food systems and digital governance, the manuscript falls short of the structure and rigor expected of a scientific article.

2. Abstract

The abstract lacks **clarity, structure, and coherence**. It reads as a disjointed listing of technologies rather than a clear summary of the **problem, method, results, and significance**.

Phrases like "*URLs, HTTP(s) on various websites*" and "*IP Address protocols*" are technically vague and poorly worded or capitalized. HTTPs is a protocol!

There are **capitalization errors** (e.g., "Activity Logs," "IP Address") and **redundant phrasings**.

No problem statement is clearly articulated in the abstract. The fragmentation of food-related information and the need for integration should be highlighted up front.

Recommendation: Rewrite the abstract to follow a standard structure:

(i) context/background → (ii) problem → (iii) proposed solution → (iv) methodology → (v) key results → (vi) implications.

3. Introduction

The introduction repeats the sentence *"Through digitalization strategies and food production innovation, stability and resilience of the country can be achieved."* twice—this must be removed. (See the first line and the fourth line.)

The phrase **"the country"** is used ambiguously; in an international journal, the country must be explicitly stated (likely Indonesia).

Many **sentences are poorly constructed and grammatically incorrect**, e.g., *"Amazon Web Services (AWS) creating innovative cloud data centers as a cloud vendor."*

The paragraph on **"Model PaaS merupakan layanan..."** includes a **non-English sentence** in Indonesian, which breaks the tone of the paper and should be removed or translated appropriately.

The discussion of cloud platforms, infrastructure, and PaaS is scattered and **lacks logical flow**. Definitions, comparisons, and use cases should be organized under separate subheadings if needed.

4. Methodology

The methodology section is overly **vague** and **lacks replicability**. Statements like *"collecting basic instruments to produce data that is real..."* are ambiguous and non-technical.

It's unclear how the system was evaluated—what **metrics, benchmarks, or validation methods** were used?

The **section labeled "Network Topology"** does not present a network diagram or topological classification—it offers only conceptual explanations.

Several subsections under *"Methods"* blur the lines between **background, implementation, and evaluation**.

Recommendation:

Add **architecture diagrams** with data flow and API logic.

Specify **software tools, frameworks, and data sources** clearly.

Detail the **experimental setup and performance evaluation criteria**.

5. Results and Discussion

There is **minimal quantitative data** or analysis. The only metrics mentioned are rough configuration runtimes (e.g., 85–95%), but these are not contextualized or compared.

The “discussion” mostly restates technical descriptions from earlier sections and lacks critical analysis.

Tables such as “Table 3. Configuration Integration Data” are **not explained in the text** or analyzed.

Figures (like the TCP configuration and cloud architecture) are **not properly labeled, described, or cited** within the narrative.

6. Technical and Language Quality

There are numerous **grammatical, syntactic, and stylistic errors** throughout.

Technical terms are often **misused or not clearly defined**.

Many paragraphs contain **list-like information dumps** rather than analytical writing.

API usage examples, code snippets, and Firebase references are inserted with little explanation or discussion of relevance.

Contribution and Novelty

While the **topic is practically relevant**, especially for local government digital transformation, the **scientific contribution is weak**.

The paper reads more like a **technical project report or deployment note** than a peer-reviewed research study.

There is no comparison with existing tools or approaches in the literature.

Recommendation:

Clearly define the **research problem**.

Offer **new theoretical insights, architecture innovations, or performance results** to justify the publication.

8. Conclusion

The conclusion is brief and superficial. It restates that PaaS was used but does not **reflect on the significance, limitations, or potential future directions**.

No follow-up research or scaling recommendations are offered.

9. References

Some references are outdated, e.g., 2018 and 2020 sources used to support cutting-edge technology claims.

A few references are incomplete or missing standard formatting (e.g., volume, issue numbers, URLs).

The connection between references and content is unclear in several places. Citations must support specific claims and appear where claims are made.

Recommendation: Major Revision with a possibility for re-review or Rejection

The manuscript is not ready for publication in its current form. The concept is promising, and the application is useful for public sector digitalization in food systems, but the execution is lacking in:

Scientific rigor

Clarity and structure

Evaluation and evidence

I recommend a rejection with encouragement to revise and resubmit after addressing the major issues outlined above. A significantly restructured manuscript, with improved writing, focused methodology, and stronger empirical validation, may be reconsidered.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.