Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_126635**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Strengthening Cybersecurity Measures for the Defense of Critical Infrastructure in the United States**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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)*
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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of cybersecurity in essential infrastructure sectors, which is increasingly relevant in today's digital landscape. By employing quantitative methods to analyze vulnerabilities and assess the effectiveness of existing frameworks, the study provides valuable insights that can inform policy and practice. Overall, the manuscript contributes meaningfully to the ongoing discourse on cybersecurity and its implications for public safety and economic stability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title **"Strengthening Cybersecurity Measures for the Defense of Critical Infrastructure in the United States"** is suitable for the article. It clearly conveys the focus of the research on enhancing cybersecurity protocols specifically for critical infrastructure sectors in the U.S.	
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.	The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive as it outlines the key findings and objectives of the study, including the identification of vulnerabilities, the impact of ransomware, and the effectiveness of the National Cybersecurity Strategy. However, to enhance clarity and depth, I suggest the following additions: **1.Specific Methodologies:** While the abstract mentions various analytical methods (e.g., logistic regression, K-means clustering), it could briefly explain the significance of these methods in the context of the study. This would provide readers with a clearer understanding of the research approach. **2.Key Findings:** Including a specific statistic or example regarding the types of vulnerabilities identified or the sectors most affected would strengthen the abstract. For instance, mentioning the percentage of incidents attributed to ransomware could highlight the urgency of the issue.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The organization facilitates a logical flow of information, allowing readers to follow the research objectives, methodologies, results, and discussions effectively.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous application of established analytical methodologies, such as logistic regression and K-means clustering, which are appropriate for assessing vulnerabilities in cybersecurity. The manuscript is grounded in relevant literature, referencing previous studies to contextualize findings and support claims, which enhances its credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references around 71 in the manuscript are a mix of recent and relevant sources, essential for maintaining the credibility and relevance of scholarly work.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript employs clear and precise language, which is essential for effectively conveying complex ideas and findings in the field of cybersecurity.	
Optional/General comments	In conclusion, the manuscript presents a well-structured and scientifically robust analysis of cybersecurity vulnerabilities within critical infrastructure.	

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Hari Gonaygunta**
Department, University & Country	**University of the Cumberlands, USA**