

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_113757
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EVOLUTION OF TERRORISM IN THE DIGITAL AGE: INVESTIGATING THE ADAPTATION OF TERRORIST GROUPS TO CYBER TECHNOLOGIES FOR RECRUITMENT, PROPAGANDA, AND CYBER ATTACKS
Type of the 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 the scientific community? (Please write a 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research paper discusses - in a general view - a very important and sensitive security topic. The scientific community needs scientific contributions that reveal the ambiguity and ambiguity of the widespread information about the reality of terrorism and the source of its origins. 2. Title wording is acceptable (fits the topic). 3. It was comprehensive. The author explained the general objective of the research topic and its importance (descriptive way). It is also it can be found that it is somewhat exaggerated in listing the basic information in detail, which may lose some of the attractiveness of the paper. A short abstract of 150-170 words is perfect for providing a comprehensive overview of the scientific research conducted by the author. 4. Yes, somewhat. 5. The research paper somewhat lacks scientific accuracy. Security studies, with their importance and sensitivity - as the rest of the scientific disciplines - require verifying the information and its sources, and not making unconfirmed judgments, so that the paper and the journal as well have greater scientific value among different readers from different countries of the world by ensuring the truthfulness of the information published, For example, the author mentioned that Al-Qassam is considered a terrorist group, while there is no global consensus on this situation between supporting parties and an opposing once based on the right of people to freedom, the issue of Palestine is an issue of occupation, not an issue of political opposition or interest groups. So - I personally - do not agree with this statement - and I ask the author to delete it as an idea before it is deleted from the paper. 6. Generally acceptable. other important books can be used, such as Alexander Dugin's books, Barry Buzan's books, and Eve Lacoste's books (Mediacratia). These are books about geopolitical thinking and analysis, which help to understand the nature of terrorism and explain more clearly the nature of new wars (generational wars), especially the fourth and fifth generations. I suggest using Security theories and Geopolitical approaches to analyze such topics, in addition to dealing seriously with the examples used, as analyzing the phenomenon requires a careful analysis of the case, and the hidings of the topic cannot be understood or revealed through a general statement, in addition to a comparative study of historical events side by side and official statements that cannot be done. Distorting it, and will enable the writer to extrapolate and extract information that he may not find contained in any previous study, and it will be more convincing and scientifically serious. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. acceptable 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Non	
---------------------------	-----	--

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:	Sofiane Belmadi
Department, University & Country	Blida 2 University, Algeria