

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_100985
Title of the Manuscript:	SECURING DATA TRANSMISSION IN MOBILE BANKING APPLICATIONS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the topic is of great important to both industry and the academician alike.</p> <p>The title was poorly constructed it can be improved by rewriting it as 'an enhanced data transmission in mobile banking using LSB-AES'.</p> <p>The abstract was not comprehensive enough as the evaluation metrics' were not mention and the benchmark for the comparison was not properly mentioned, the methodology was not started clearly in the abstract and the in-depth result was not discussed. The subsection of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, is scientifically correct though a little adjustment will have to be made.</p> <p>Yes, they are recent and efficient</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes though more scientific approach should be involve the limitations of the algorithms and the techniques were not properly cited and the research choice of LSB-AES algorithms over other algorithms and techniques were not provide,</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### PART 2:

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Salla Nelson Stanley</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Center for Translation and Implementation Research, University of Nigeria, Nigeria</b>