

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_123574
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation of Shamir Adleman's Rivest Algorithm in Securing User Login OTP in the Film Bank Application
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The paper is well written and well structured. Need to elaborate the RSA algorithm For Fig.No:8 – place graphical abstract in place of flow chart – looks good Grammatical corrections to be verified in the paper Include more number of references	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In title the algorithm is written as “Shamir Adleman's Rivest Algorithm”. But in all the manuscript it was represented as “Rivest Shamir Adleman's Algorithm” Suggest to change the title to avoid confusion.	
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.	Abstract is well written – Suggest to check for grammar corrections	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, written good	
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 is technically sound and is useful for further developments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Need to include more latest references	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, the way of presentation to be improved	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	GRK Prasad
Department, University & Country	India