

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_124408
Title of the Manuscript:	Intelligent connected vehicle information security risks and countermeasures
Type of the Article	Review

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses an important topic within its field, which has the potential to contribute to ongoing discussions in the scientific community. However, while the subject matter is relevant, the manuscript falls short in providing meaningful insights due to a lack of depth in the research methodology and inadequate comparative analysis. The absence of rigorous validation and insufficient contextual grounding diminishes the value of the work, making it less impactful for advancing knowledge in this area. Overall, though the topic is promising, the execution does not meet the standards expected for a significant contribution to the field.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	NA	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	Yes	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	NA	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The scientific correctness of this manuscript is questionable due to several significant methodological flaws. The manuscript lacks a detailed explanation of the experimental setup and validation process, which raises concerns about the accuracy and reliability of the findings. Moreover, without a comprehensive comparative analysis or benchmarking against established methods, it is difficult to assess whether the proposed approach is scientifically robust. These gaps <b>in scientific rigor undermine the technical soundness of the work, limiting its contribution to the field.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	NA	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of Comprehensive Literature Review</li> <li>2. Insufficient Comparative Analysis</li> <li>3. Methodological Gaps</li> <li>4. Insufficient Results and Discussion</li> <li>5. Lack of Clarity and Organization</li> </ol> <p>After thoroughly reviewing the manuscript titled “Intelligent connected vehicle information security risks and countermeasures” I regret to recommend its rejection due to several critical shortcomings that impact the quality and contribution of the paper. Below are the key concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Lack of Comprehensive Literature Review:</b> The manuscript does not provide a sufficient review of the existing literature. The authors have referenced only a limited number of studies, and key relevant works in the field are either missing or briefly mentioned without a thorough analysis. This undermines the contextual foundation of the study, leaving the reader unclear about how this research fits within the broader academic conversation.</li> <li>2. <b>Insufficient Comparative Analysis:</b> One of the major weaknesses of the paper is the absence of a robust comparison with other relevant methods or approaches. The manuscript fails to benchmark its results against existing standards or competing techniques, making it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness and significance of the proposed approach. Comparative analysis is crucial in demonstrating the improvement or unique contributions of the current work.</li> <li>3. <b>Methodological Gaps:</b> The methodology section lacks sufficient detail, particularly regarding the experimental setup and evaluation metrics. Important aspects such as the sample size, dataset description, and statistical rigor are inadequately discussed. Additionally, the approach taken by the authors seems to lack rigorous validation, which raises concerns about the reliability and generalizability of the results.</li> <li>4. <b>Insufficient Results and Discussion:</b> The results presented in the manuscript are sparse and lack depth. There is little discussion on the implications of the findings, and no critical reflection on potential limitations or future work. This leaves the reader with unanswered questions and reduces the overall impact of the study.</li> <li>5. <b>Lack of Clarity and Organization:</b> The manuscript suffers from a lack of clarity in its presentation. Several sections are disorganized, making it difficult to follow the authors' line of reasoning. The structure could benefit from clearer headings and a logical flow from the introduction through to the conclusion.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shalini Yadav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The North Cap University, India</b>