Paper: **"Challenges in Cloud Computing Adoption for SMEs in the Middle East"**

Corresponding Author: Fatma Abudaqqa

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Itumeleng Letsolo
UNICAF, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Enriko Ceko
Canadian Institute of Technology, Albania

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Itumeleng Letsolo	
University/Country: UNICAF / MALAWI	
Date Manuscript Received: 8 Dec 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 Dec 2024
Manuscript Title: Challenges in Cloud Computing Adoption for SMEs in the Middle East	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Approved	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
Title of the paper is clear and adequate	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**5**
The abstract covers objects, research methods, results and recommendations	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**1**
There are some grammatical errors and most of which are underscored by AI. There is a need to revisit the document and proofread further. *Fonts and spacing are inconsistently applied thus affecting the quality of the paper* *There is a need to also revisit the numbering of the sections*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
Study method explained but its too brief and there is a room for improvement. Please also work on the formatting and numbering	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
Results are not clear for readers of the article. The paragraph can be expanded further to elaborate on the results	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
Conclusion is too brief and there is a room for improvement so that the recommendations tally well with the conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
References to be on a fresh page, work on the numbering. They are comprehensive and appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):   proof reading necessary Apply fonts and formatting properly

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Enriko Ceko	
University/Country: Canadian Institute of Technology/Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 7ᵗʰ December 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 16ᵗʰ December 2024
Manuscript Title: **Challenges in Cloud Computing Adoption for SMEs in the Middle East**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 52.11.24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**

The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article, but the period taken into the consideration into the research should be noticed. For example: "Challenges in Cloud Computing Adoption for SMEs in the Middle East between 2020 – 2023"…	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**2**
The abstract should include the aim of the author handling this research, the methodology and methods used, and the main conclusion/recommendation.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
It is OK.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
They are explained, but there is no need for a hypothesis paragraph to be included since there is no hypothesis verification numerically. (.2 Hypothesis Test Results -no need to mention.),	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
There are a lot of studies on the issue, and they should be included into the literature review. This is a "must".	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	