

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJEBA_107828
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating and Establishing Baseline Security Requirements in Cloud Computing: An Enterprise Risk Management Approach
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>1. Importance of manuscript for scientific community Yes the Manuscript is relevant to the scientific community particularly as it outlines the inevitable need for adopting baseline security protocols right from the feasibility studies phase for establishing an enterprise. The imminent opportunities that cloud computing presents. The conventional key baseline security protocols for consideration when utilizing cloud computing as an enterprise.</p> <p>2. SUTABLE TITLE FOR THE ARTICLE <i>Assessing Cloud Computing Security Baseline Security Requirements: An Enterprise Risk Management Perspective</i></p> <p>3. Abstract Comments No. The Abstract is not comprehensive. The abstract is reasonably good but it does not give a decent recap of the work. Some missing components that ought to be captured in the abstract include: summary of the methods/methodology, tools and data(type,source, sample size e.t.c.) used in the study; a summary of the result of the research. Also, some components captured in the abstract are more suitable in other sections like the background, these have been commented on in the manuscript(refer to the attached manuscript).</p> <p>The font size of the headings and subheadings should be made bigger than the write-up captured in the body of the work. The paragraphing style should be improved upon. The author should consider using the block paragraph style. At least one or two lines should be used to separate major sections such as the body of the introduction and the Literature review heading. →The author should consider numbering the sections and subsections of the work e.g:</p> <p>2.0 Literature Review,</p> <p>2.1 Baseline Security Requirements Cloud Computing Within an Enterprise Risk Management Framework</p> <p>This helps to give a better structure to the work and organize the flow of sections in a hierarchical order.</p> <p>To a large degree, the manuscript is scientifically appropriate but some key requirements were not captured which include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under the Literature Review Section, there is no sufficient comparison and contrast of the perspectives of different authors on each theme, also, the author did not sufficiently capture his thoughts or insights on hypothesis and postulations presented by different authors. Furthermore, No research gaps in the works of the numerous authors were outlined. The 	

Review Form 1.7

<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>key insights derived from the works of the authors(consulted) which were employed to complete the work were either missing or not properly highlighted.</p> <p>2. The methodology used was not captured. This is important because, in a scientific setting, the methodology, tools, data e.t.c. are needed to replicate the result detailed in the work for confirmation. Additionally, some issues with the data used include: Time period when these data captured was not stated, What are the demographics of the participants? Was any data protection policy(ies) considered. These are key concerns that need to be addressed.</p> <p>3. Although the problem definition for the work is clear, it is not sufficiently convincing or clear what outcomes the research has achieved i.e. what novel contribution has arisen from this research? What key cloud security protocols are recommended for enterprises in respect to the findings of this research? What postulations or hypothesis have been derived that can guide future research?</p> <p>6. COMMENTS ON THE REFERENCE LIST</p> <p>The references are recent and reasonably sufficient but some observations have been made as outlined below:</p> <p>→ Multiple works by the same Author/group of author with the same year was not properly cited specifically the Author: <u>Olaniyi.....2023, Olabanji 2023 etc.</u> An alphabet needs to be added by the end of the year e.g. (Olaniyi , 2023a), (Olaniyi , 2023b), (Olaniyi , 2023c) so as to distinguish which of the particular works of the author is been cited in a particular context. To correct this, the author is advised to refer to https://uow.libguides.com/uow-apa7/book-same-year</p> <p>→ Some authors were found in the reference list but not cited in the body of the work. Eg:</p> <p><u>Olaniyi O. O. (2022, April 26). Best Practices to Encourage Girls' Education in Maiha Local Government Area of Adamawa State in Nigeria. The University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service (Research Gate).</u></p> <p><u>Olaniyi, O.O. & Omubo, D.S. (2023). The Importance of COSO Framework Compliance in Information Technology Auditing and Enterprise Resource Management. <i>The International Journal of Innovative Research & Development</i>. https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2023/v12/i5/MAY23001</u></p> <p>Olagbaju, O. O., Babalola R.O., & Olaniyi, O. O. (2023). Code Alternation in English as a Second Language Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. <i>Nova Science</i>. https://doi.org/10.52305/YLHJ5878</p> <p>Olagbaju, O. O., & Olaniyi, O. O. (2023). Explicit and Differentiated Phonics Instruction on Pupils' Literacy Skills in Gambian Lower Basic Schools. <i>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</i>, 44(2), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2023/v44i2958</p>	
---	--	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language an choice of words is reasonably good but in some instances, the statements are verbose and the adjectives used are not appropriate for the context. Examples: in the Abstract section, the use of words like: elevate, grapple , are not appropriate for the context. There are others in the body of the work, some of which were highlighted.	
Optional/General comments	The paragraphing style used is archaic(i.e. the right indentation style). The author should consider using the block paragraph style which is the most widely adopted style currently. More specific recommendations have been added to the manuscripts as comments, the author should refer to them and consider adopting the recommendations.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Munura Maihankali
Department, University & Country	Taraba State College of Health Technology, Nigeria