

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	Original 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 contributes to the ongoing efforts in phishing detection by introducing the PCS model, which attempts to account for psychological manipulation techniques used in phishing attacks. However, the paper could benefit from a more thorough investigation of phishing tactics, especially considering the limited sample size used in the study (only 40 emails, half of which are from personal accounts). Despite these limitations, the research highlights a critical gap in current phishing detection models, particularly in understanding psychological triggers, making it a valuable starting point for further exploration in this domain.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	NA	
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 provides a basic overview of the study but lacks critical details. It mentions testing the model on only 40 emails, which is insufficient to demonstrate the model's efficacy across a variety of phishing tactics. Additionally, the abstract does not mention the gap in the literature regarding psychological manipulation in phishing attacks or the need for adaptive learning mechanisms within the model. I suggest expanding the abstract to include a brief discussion of these points and clarify the limitations regarding sample size.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The overall structure of the manuscript could be improved. The introduction could be more concise and better organized to avoid repetitive statements. A single paragraph summarizing the impact of phishing would strengthen the introduction, followed by a discussion of the relevant psychological theories. Additionally, the methodology section could benefit from more detail regarding the use of Systematic Literature Review (SLR) and Meta-Analysis, as the current explanation is somewhat vague.	
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.	The study is scientifically relevant, especially in attempting to integrate psychological factors into phishing detection. However, the paper would benefit from more detailed analysis of phishing emails, especially technical elements like email headers, IP addresses, or HTML code. This would provide a deeper understanding of how phishing tactics have evolved beyond superficial traits like sender name mismatches. Additionally, the PCS model could be strengthened by incorporating adaptive learning mechanisms to address the evolving nature of phishing tactics.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are somewhat limited, and more recent works on phishing detection, particularly those incorporating machine learning or NLP, should be included. I would suggest reviewing recent studies that explore more advanced phishing detection methods and their incorporation of machine learning, NLP, and continual learning techniques to provide a more comprehensive foundation for the model.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear, but there are areas where the text could be more concise and precise. Some sentences in the introduction, in particular, are repetitive. Simplifying these sections would make the paper more accessible to readers.	
Optional/General comments	The PCS model is not generally a novel idea but appears to rely on binary rules for classification (e.g., marking emails as spam based on mismatches in sender information). This approach may be too simplistic to effectively handle more sophisticated phishing attacks, such as domain spoofing or content manipulation. It would be beneficial to integrate more complex detection techniques, including domain reputation analysis, link validation, and even NLP-based analysis of the email content, to create a more robust solution. Furthermore, exploring the potential of adaptive learning algorithms would make the model more effective in responding to emerging phishing tactics.	

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:	Ibanga Kpereobong Friday
Department, University & Country	Siksha 'O' Anusandhan (Deemed to be) University, Nigeria