

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_94316
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Security Challenges of Big Data Analytics: A Systematic Literature Review.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The study paper was written by the author by copying and pasting or lightly editing current research articles that were relevant. Nothing fresh has been held back from your end. By reading contemporary study articles, you may add your own thoughts to them.</p> <p>The figure is quite hazy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is nothing new from the author's perspective. Along with this chapter, the author ought to offer some of his own reflections. The author arranged the previously suggested data haphazardly.</li> <li>2. Grammatical mistakes in the research paper are highlighted in yellow. It is difficult to highlight each and every grammatical mistake. It is the responsibility of the writer to re-analyze and revise the chapter.</li> <li>3. Create the outcome section taking the discussion section as a guide.</li> <li>4. After reading the research paper, it does not at all resemble a research work. Although the introduction and discussion sections have been preserved, this chapter really needs further sections.</li> <li>5. Grammatical mistakes in the chapter are highlighted in yellow. It is difficult to highlight each and every grammatical mistake. It is the responsibility of the writer to re-analyze and revise the chapter.</li> <li>6. There must be a full reinterpretation, and some claims must be expressed in clear terms rather than ambiguous ones. Please update the spelling if it appears to be incorrect.</li> <li>7. Sentences that don't fit the research have been used in a few paragraphs. Remove these and replace them with research-related sentences. Keep the paragraphs in order so that the reader can make adjustments because the order is disorganized as well.</li> <li>8. Use a variety of graphics to support your studied data.</li> <li>9. A summary of how the work advances the area from the current level of knowledge should have been included in the conclusion. In the conclusion section, the author should clearly justify the effort and, if relevant, mention any uses or extensions.</li> <li>10. When discussing the implications that may be made from this research paper work, for instance, there is no coherence between the abstract and the research paper's substance.</li> <li>11. The introduction is supposed to introduce the problem to be solved in this chapter. Are there any existing solutions? Which is the best? What are its main limitations? What does the author hope to achieve? Properly address them in the introduction.</li> <li>12. There is no coherence between the abstract and the content of the research paper, for example, addressing the conclusions that can be drawn from this research paper.</li> <li>13. It has been cut and pasted this chapter. Because of this, the chapter's interest has nearly completely vanished.</li> <li>14. The author merely created the research paper by providing references; nothing is held against him. By including a few points from his own perspective, the author could make this research paper more engaging.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shyam R. Sihare</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Government College, India</b>