

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_116951</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bias and Fairness Issues in Artificial Intelligence-driven Cybersecurity</b>
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers involved in the fields of artificial intelligence (AI) and cybersecurity.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes, the title is suitable.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the main objectives, problem statement, significance, discussion points, and conclusion of the manuscript.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>5. <b>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its approach and discussion of the intersection between artificial intelligence (AI) and cybersecurity, as well as the associated bias and fairness issues.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Yes, The citation are included in the script.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communication. Here are some reasons supporting this assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Clarity:</b> The language used appears clear and understandable, making it accessible to a scholarly audience. Complex concepts are explained in a straightforward manner, aiding comprehension.</li> <li>2. <b>Coherence:</b> The text flows logically from one point to the next, with cohesive transitions between sections. This helps maintain the reader's focus and facilitates understanding of the content.</li> <li>3. <b>Technical Terminology:</b> The manuscript incorporates technical terminology relevant to the fields of artificial intelligence (AI) and cybersecurity. This demonstrates a level of proficiency and expertise in the subject matter.</li> <li>4. <b>Academic Tone:</b> The tone of the writing appears formal and appropriate for scholarly communication. The author(s) present their arguments and discussions in a professional manner, adhering to academic conventions.</li> <li>5. <b>Grammar and Syntax:</b> The manuscript appears to be free of grammatical errors and syntactical issues. This contributes to the overall clarity and readability of the text.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, the language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sampath Talluri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Western Michigan University, USA</b>