

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_112467
Title of the Manuscript:	Maximizing Penetration Testing Success with Effective Reconnaissance Techniques using ChatGPT
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>The manuscript topic is interesting and is noteworthy to be examined at a greater detail.</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate and concise. It holds the intended meaning of the study that it wishes to examine.</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>The author should rewrite the abstract in my opinion. The abstract should answer the following questions in a paragraph format:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Why is the study conducted? (Purpose) b) How the study is conducted (Method) c) What was found from the study? (Findings) d) What is the contribution of the study in existing knowledge? (Originality) <p>The abstract should provide a brief of the article and create interest for the reader to invest time in reading the whole article. Currently the abstract written is perceived to be an introduction, rather a brief of the study.</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>Considering the structure of the article, the author has divided the findings & discussion into separate sections. The section "Methodology" should be written as "Materials and Methods" and should provide a more robust discussion over how the whole study was conducted. Materials and Method is a crucial part for any scientific study and this section should be detailed and well-written. The author may include some sub-headings, such as: Research Design, Sampling, Procedure, Tools, Timeline etc, whichever subsections those applies to this study and explain accordingly for the betterment of the study.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>The manuscript, although tries to focus on a timely topic, requires addressing the following issues for the betterment of the study. I have tried to highlight the issues section by section for the convenience of the author. I have added line numbering option in the document for better referencing of the lines that I am pointing out the issue on.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Line 40-44: The author should bring this discussion in the beginning to provide an introductory discussion on ChatGPT before directly starting with the security measures. The introduction on ChatGPT should be more detailed and robust to give the readers a clear understanding of ChatGPT.</p> <p>Line 25-31: The authors have mentioned that there are many security measures currently at place alongside the penetration test. It would be more meaningful if the author mentions about the other tests and the reason for penetration test being the better one amongst the alternatives.</p> <p>General Comment: The study is missing a core research question, a question statement that the study wishes to answer. This is a mandatory element for any</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>scientific study and the authors should include a research question for the study so that the readers can understand what the authors have tried to answer in through this study.</p> <p>The authors should also highlight through a short paragraph regarding why they have chosen this topic. Has this topic been previously studied? Were there any gaps? Were there any methodological flaws? These are important for understanding how the research question was derived and why this study adds value.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>Line 46-53: A specific research approach and design is missing from the section. The authors should mention the specific appropriate method, not vague terms like “Case Study”. The authors should also make sub-sections for this section (mentioned earlier) and provide a clear step by step process of how the authors have conducted the trial-and-error run.</p> <p>Line 56-57: The authors have mentioned that “<i>questions had to be tailored in a specific way to obtain information usable for the reconnaissance phase of a penetration test.</i>” However, the authors should be clearer about the questionnaire like how they have developed it, how many questions were there, how they have tested the validity and biasness of the questions, etc, to ensure that the result does not possess any biasness. Many earlier studies have pointed out that ChatGPT, being a pretrained model, delivers error and biased results. Thus, it is essential for the authors to share how they managed to make a questionnaire through which they have expected to get the intended results.</p> <p>Line 58-59: The authors have mentioned that “<i>There was much trial and error required as customizing questions requesting specific types of data did not always deliver desirable results.</i>” The authors should describe the criteria based on which they have decided the desirability of the results. What was their expected total accuracy? What was their cutoff criteria for considering a result to be accepted or rejected? These answers should be addressed for the betterment of the study.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Although the authors have tried to provide a possible hypothesized outcome to what ChatGPT may do, the overall section lacks a core characteristic of the study – feasibility. As the study does not have a specific section of “Literature Review”, the assumptions made by the author are solely based on hypothesis, neither proven practically, nor through literature backed argumentatively. The overall section should answer through proofs that what are the steps, if taken, ChatGPT may provide the solution instead of hypothesizing that ChatGPT can do this if the prompt is that. The author should provide a scientific proof or literature backed argument that justifies their claims.</p> <p>In addition, while ChatGPT’s access to information is poised to be a threat to privacy (Opted and proven in numerous studies), this study opines to design a system that may hamper the privacy even more, providing access of several analytical aspects of a domain to ChatGPT. This may hamper a company’s competitive advantage and make information public to the user of ChatGPT.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Line 188-194: This paragraph discusses about the limitations of the study and the scope of future research. This should go after the final paragraph in the “Conclusion” section.</p> <p>General Comment: The discussion should also include citations of studies that may have provided a contrasting view of the author’s perspective. The author has</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	only provided supportive views that does not provide a holistic view of the scenario.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The writing is straight forward and communicative. But the overall flow of the writeup is redundant and requires to be rewritten to ensure a better flow and improved readability. There are grammatical errors throughout the article, requiring to be corrected accordingly.	
Optional/General comments	The study has an interesting topic, but severely lacks transparency, authenticity, and practicality due to methodological gap and poor arguments, neither backed by literature, nor physical proof. Considering the approach and the structure of the study, a separate literature review consisting of recent literature is a must for the study. Otherwise, the study is only based upon unproven assumptions that severely questions the implications of the arguments brought forward. I believe, the authors may need to invest a significant amount of time on the study to make the study more argumentative and realistically applicable.	

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:	Ahnaf Chowdhury Niloy
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh