Paper: **"Advancing Cloud Adoption in the Saudi Public Sector: Challenges, Global Insights, and Strategic Policy Recommendations"**

Corresponding Author: Abdal Hafeth Alaraj

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gibet Tani Hicham
Abdemalek Essaadi University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Dolantina Hyka
Mediterranean University of Albania

Reviewer 3: Hadi Sutopo
Topazart, Indonesia

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is concise, informative, and accurately reflects the content.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract effectively summarizes the research objectives.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Minor repetitions and sentence restructuring may be needed.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Authors need to implicitly highlight the methodology in a dedicated section.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
One paragraph is duplicated and should be corrected: "Regulatory and operational oversight ....and operational standards."
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion is clear and reflects the main insights of the paper.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Excellent use of up-to-date sources.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes, your title is clear, informative, and professional. It effectively communicates the focus of the work. Here's a quick breakdown:
"Advancing Cloud Adoption in the Saudi Public Sector" – Clearly states the geographic and sectoral focus.
"Challenges, Global Insights, and Strategic Policy Recommendations" – Indicates the structure and depth, suggesting a comprehensive approach.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract could be strengthened by using dynamic verbs such as 'explores,' 'uncovers,' and 'proposes,' which are commonly used in academic writing to convey purpose and contribution more effectively.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The article is generally well-written and professionally structured. The grammar and spelling are strong overall, but there are a few minor grammatical issues, redundancies, and stylistic tweaks that could improve clarity and polish.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
No — the study methods are not explicitly stated. While the article is rich in analysis and references policy documents, reports, and literature, it lacks a clearly defined "Methods" section that explains how the data was gathered, what sources were analyzed, and what analytical approach was used.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The paper is well-structured, well-argued, and clearly written. Overall, it demonstrates a strong grasp of academic tone and appropriate terminology for the subject matter. However, a few minor grammar, phrasing, and repetition issues should be addressed to ensure clarity and polish. Below is a detailed assessment of clarity and correctness.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Yes, the Conclusion is accurate and well-supported by the content of your paper. It effectively summarizes the key arguments and findings while reinforcing the paper's analytical structure.

However, a few minor refinements would improve its precision, cohesion, and alignment with the preceding analysis. Here's a breakdown of its strengths and areas for potential enhancement:

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, the list of references appears both comprehensive and appropriate for an academic article focused on cloud computing adoption in the Saudi Arabian public sector.

While the references are excellent, consider the following for even more depth:

Include at least one citation from a high-impact journal like Government Information Quarterly or Information Systems Journal, if relevant, to boost academic rigor.

Add a citation or report from a global institution like the OECD, World Bank, or UN e-Government Survey if you want to further enrich the comparative analysis section.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you for submitting your manuscript on "Advancing Cloud Adoption in the Saudi Public Sector: Challenges, Global Insights, and Strategic Policy Recommendations." Your paper addresses a highly relevant and timely topic, particularly within the context of Saudi Arabia's

Vision 2030 and broader digital transformation efforts.
Minor Revisions Suggested:
1. Add a Methods Section:
A brief explanation of the research design (policy analysis/literature synthesis), source selection, and analytical process will strengthen academic rigor.

2 Fix Minor Redundancies and Formatting:
Streamline repeated sections (e.g., duplicated agency roles).
Standardize citation formatting in the reference list.

3 Optional Enhancement:
End with a slightly more impactful closing sentence in the conclusion.
If feasible, briefly integrate or mention a case example or primary data in future iterations to increase originality.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the scope and focus of the article. It highlights both the local (Saudi) context and the broader (global insights and strategic recommendations) framing.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract provides a coherent summary of the objectives, methodology, key findings, and practical recommendations. It is informative and aligns well with the article content.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The article is generally well-written and professionally structured. However, there are minor grammatical redundancies (e.g., a repeated paragraph in the "Saudi Arabia Context" section) and a few sentence constructions that could be streamlined for clarity.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Although the study is qualitative and largely policy-review based, the methodology is sound. The author uses a literature-driven analytical approach combined with comparative analysis of international practices, which is suitable for this type of policy study.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body is well-organized, with clearly labeled sections that follow a logical flow: Introduction, Literature Review, Context, Key Challenges, Comparative Practices, and Recommendations. Each section contributes meaningfully to the article's objectives.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion effectively synthesizes the key insights and reiterates the significance of aligning policy with institutional readiness. It also provides actionable recommendations and a balanced outlook on Saudi Arabia's cloud strategy.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The reference list in the article is accurate and complete. All in-text citations are properly matched with corresponding entries in the reference list, and there are no missing or extra sources. The formatting is mostly consistent, though minor improvements such as adding missing DOIs and ensuring uniform style would enhance its quality. Overall, the references are appropriate, up to date, and relevant to the content of the paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Please review the duplicated paragraph under "Saudi Arabia Context" regarding the roles of regulatory bodies. Consolidate for clarity.

A light proofreading round is advised to ensure consistency in sentence structure and to eliminate any typographical repetitions.

Consider providing a brief note on the study limitations to enhance methodological transparency.