

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_116180
Title of the Manuscript:	Cybersecurity and Cryptography: The New Era of Quantum Computing
Type of the Article	

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>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>1. Yes, this work explores the implications of quantum computing on cybersecurity and cryptography, highlighting the challenges posed by this technological advancement and exploring solutions such as post-quantum cryptography to safeguard data against potential threats.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the key components of the study.</p> <p>3. The abstract seems moderately comprehensive. It could benefit from more specific details regarding the methodologies employed and the key findings of the study.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript need revision, particularly regarding numbering errors such as "3.0 POST QUANTUM CRYPTOGRAPHY" and "4.0 Conclusion". It's essential to ensure consistency and accuracy in numbering to maintain clarity and organization throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript's scientific correctness is questionable. The proposed approach lacks clarity, and there is a lack of results and discussion. These elements are essential for a comprehensive scientific analysis, and their absence suggests that the manuscript may not meet the standards of scientific rigor.</p> <p>6. The references provided seem adequate for supporting the content of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Serial Rayene Boussalia
Department, University & Country	Constantine 1 University, Algeria