

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_126824
Title of the Manuscript:	Cybercrime and its Psychological Tricks and Traps and Computer Securities
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses the intersection of cybersecurity and psychology, emphasizing the psychological tricks used in phishing attacks. This focus on psychological factors is valuable as it highlights a critical aspect often underemphasized in traditional cybersecurity approaches. It introduces the Psycho-Cybercrime Solution (PCS) model, which could enhance current preventative measures by addressing psychological vulnerabilities. Overall, this manuscript contributes meaningfully to our understanding of cyber threats and prevention strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is largely suitable. However, for clarity, it could be slightly revised to: "Cybercrime: Psychological Tricks, Traps, and Computer Security Challenges."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from a more explicit outline of key findings and recommendations, particularly the PCS model's unique contributions and its testing results. Adding a statement on its potential applicability or future work would also enhance its clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from a more explicit outline of key findings and recommendations, particularly the PCS model's unique contributions and its testing results. Adding a statement on its potential applicability or future work would also enhance its clarity.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, especially in its exploration of phishing through both technical and psychological lenses. The use of a systematic literature review and meta-analysis provides a strong basis for its conclusions. The PCS model appears well-conceived and adequately tested, with insights that are both practically and theoretically sound. Additionally, the literature cited is recent and relevant, supporting the scientific grounding of this work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and recent. A few additional studies on psychological-based cybersecurity models could further enhance the work's depth.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, though there are minor grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	Consider including recent publications on psychological approaches to cybersecurity beyond phishing to broaden the context.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arkar Htet
Department, University & Country	Mullion Façade Engineering School, Myanmar