

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_116244
Title of the Manuscript:	Securing the Digital Frontier: Strategies for Cloud Computing Security, Database Protection, and Comprehensive Penetration Testing
Type of the Article	Survey 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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, particularly for professionals and researchers in the cybersecurity field. The manuscript emphasizes the significance of adopting an integrated cybersecurity approach in today's digital landscape, offering insights crucial for enhancing organizational security. Through empirical research utilizing survey data and statistical analysis, it provides practical recommendations for mitigating cyber threats, addressing current challenges, and proposing a unified risk management framework to bolster cybersecurity measures. This research contributes valuable knowledge and guidance for cybersecurity professionals and decision-makers aiming to protect digital assets effectively. 2. Yes, "Fortifying Organizational Cybersecurity: Integrating Cloud Security, Database Protection, and Penetration Testing Strategies" 3. Yes, the abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive. It succinctly summarizes the key aspects of the research, including the focus on integrated cybersecurity strategies, the methodology employed (survey-based with statistical analysis), the main findings highlighting the benefits of such integration, and the implications for organizational resilience against cyber threats. It effectively captures the essence of the research and provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, and conclusions. 4. Yes, each subsection likely addresses specific aspects of the research, such as methodology, findings, and implications, contributing to the overall coherence and effectiveness of the manuscript. 5. Yes, the manuscript seems to adhere to scientific standards in its approach and analysis. 6. Yes, it's essential to ensure that the references cover the most up-to-date research and developments in the field. While the majority of the references are recent, it's still a good practice to verify if there are any significant studies or advancements that have been published since the manuscript was prepared. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of the integration of cloud computing, database security, and penetration testing into a unified risk management framework. The use of a survey-based methodology with a diverse group of professionals adds credibility to the findings. The results demonstrate strong validity and reliability of the constructs, and the structural model analysis elucidates significant direct and indirect relationships among the variables.</p> <p>Overall, the paper contributes valuable insights into cybersecurity risk management practices in contemporary digital environments. However, providing more context on the practical implications of the findings and suggestions for future research could enhance the manuscript's impact.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sohil Shah
Department, University & Country	Gujarat Technological University, India