

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_113632
Title of the Manuscript:	A SYSTEMATIC PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF SECURITY METHODS FOR THE CYBERWORLD
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. The paper offers a thorough overview of cybersecurity concerns in today's interconnected society, covering various sectors and the importance of robust security measures.</p> <p>2. It critically analyzes existing methodologies, strengths, weaknesses, and potential shortcomings, aiming to improve the effectiveness of security measures. The inclusion of diverse research works adds depth to the analysis.</p> <p>3. The paper proposes a generic computer security model tailored to address cybersecurity challenges and highlights potential real-world applications, emphasizing proactive measures to mitigate cyber threats effectively.</p> <p>4. The paper provides detailed explanations of the mode of operation for biometric and forensic security approaches, enhancing understanding for readers unfamiliar with these concepts.</p> <p>5. The paper could benefit from improvements in language clarity and formatting. Some sentences are lengthy and complex, making it challenging for readers to grasp the main points easily.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>6. Although the paper describes algorithms and processes, the absence of visual aids like diagrams or tables may hinder comprehension, especially for readers with limited technical knowledge.</p> <p>7. While the paper briefly mentions challenges in biometric system performance and forensic investigations, it could delve deeper into these issues and explore potential solutions or areas for further research.</p> <p>8. The citation style appears inconsistent throughout the paper, which may affect its academic credibility. Ensuring uniformity in citation format would enhance the professionalism of the research between the year of 2013-24.</p> <p>9. In some sections, the paper presents an overwhelming amount of technical detail, which may overwhelm readers seeking a high-level understanding of cybersecurity concepts. Streamlining the content while retaining key insights could improve readability.</p> <p>10. Overall, the research paper offers valuable insights into cybersecurity methods and trends, but refinements in language, formatting, and depth of discussion could enhance its clarity and impact.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	K. Ravichandran
Department, University & Country	DR MGR Educational and Research Institute, India