

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	

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 holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of cybersecurity and psychology, as it emphasizes the need to address phishing attacks through both technical and psychological approaches. By proposing the Psycho-Cybercrime Solution (PCS) model, the paper contributes a novel perspective that incorporates behavioral insights to detect and prevent phishing attacks, filling a gap where traditional security methods fall short. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on psychological traps in cybercrime, as it highlights an often-overlooked aspect that directly involves the user as an enabler of their vulnerability. However, the paper could benefit from further empirical validation of the PCS model in diverse real-world settings to reinforce its applicability and robustness.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Addressing Phishing through Psychological and Technical Measures: Introducing the Psycho-Cybercrime Solution (PCS) Model	
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and effectively organized to guide the reader through the research.	
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 manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound in its approach to addressing phishing through a combination of psychological and technical analyses. By employing a systematic literature review (SLR) and meta-analysis, it adopts a rigorous method to consolidate and assess existing research on phishing, ensuring that the proposed Psycho-Cybercrime Solution (PCS) model is grounded in empirical evidence. The PCS model itself is systematically developed, with clearly defined decision dimensions and rules that are logically aligned with known phishing techniques. Additionally, the testing on 40 email messages offers preliminary but valuable insights into the model's effectiveness, suggesting a promising foundation for further real-world application and validation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The manuscript includes a sufficient number of references, covering various aspects of cybersecurity, phishing, and psychological manipulation in cybercrime.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some areas where minor revisions could enhance clarity and flow. Some sentences are lengthy or redundant, which can be streamlined for better readability. Additionally, a few grammatical and syntactical errors are present that could benefit from a careful proofread. Improving these aspects would make the article more polished and accessible to a scholarly audience.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Temitope Adekunle
Department, University & Country	University of Colorado, United State