

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

Compulsory 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript offers a valuable contribution to securing user login data by implementing the RSA algorithm in OTP encryption, which is crucial for enhancing security in the film bank application. The approach addresses key concerns regarding the vulnerability of OTPs and demonstrates solid results through avalanche effect testing. While the study is practical and relevant, it could be strengthened by comparing the RSA with alternative cryptographic methods to further highlight its advantages.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Implementation of Shamir Adleman's Rivest Algorithm in Securing User Login OTP in the Film Bank Application," is somewhat lengthy and could be streamlined for clarity and impact. A more concise and focused title might be:</p> <p>"Securing User Login OTP with RSA Encryption in a Film Bank Application."</p> <p>This title retains the key elements while making it more concise and easier to understand.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, providing an overview of the problem, the solution (RSA encryption for OTP), and the testing results. However, it could benefit from more clarity and conciseness. Here are a few suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Addition: Briefly mention the importance of secure OTP in preventing unauthorized access and why RSA was chosen over other algorithms. Clarification: Explain more clearly how the RSA-encrypted OTP is converted into a QR code for delivery via email, as this is a unique feature of the implementation. Improvement: The avalanche effect results could be linked more directly to the security advantages, emphasizing why the 51.9% result is significant. <p>A refined version could improve the flow and make the abstract more focused on the problem-solution-result structure.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, covering key elements such as the introduction, methodology, system implementation, results, and conclusion. However, some improvements could be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Subsection clarity: The sections could benefit from more distinct headings, especially in the results and discussion sections, where the implementation details and testing results could be shown and be split more clearly (e.g., "System Implementation" and "Testing & Results"). Flow: The introduction could be more focused, moving from general context to the problem and solution more smoothly. Breaking down some long paragraphs into subsections could improve readability. System Development: It might be helpful to break this section into smaller parts, such as "Feature Development" and "Security Implementation" for clearer understanding. <p>Please revise and enhance the figure captions and table headings to ensure they are clear, informative, and adhere to the standards expected in scientific research papers.</p> <p>In summary, the structure works well but could be refined for better clarity and flow.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is somehow scientifically robust as it applies well-established cryptographic principles, specifically the RSA algorithm, to address a real-world problem of securing OTPs in a film bank application. The authors effectively demonstrate the functionality of the system through a combination of practical implementation and rigorous testing experimentally, such as the avalanche effect, which shows the system's resistance to tampering. The inclusion of both encryption and decryption</p>	

Review Form 3

	processes, alongside the validation of results through black-box testing, adds to the technical soundness of the work. However, additional comparison with other cryptographic algorithms could further strengthen the manuscript's scientific depth.	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are not sufficient, not recent, and not enough to fully support the study. Many references are outdated, with some dating back several years, which may not reflect the most recent advancements in cryptography, especially in the application of RSA for OTP encryption. Furthermore, the manuscript would benefit from additional references on recent developments in secure authentication methods, advancements in RSA, and comparisons with other encryption techniques.</p> <p>I suggest including more recent research papers (within the last 5 years) on OTP security, cryptographic algorithms, and practical applications in data security to provide a stronger and more up-to-date foundation for the study.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is adequate but could benefit from improvement for scholarly communication. While the key points are generally understandable, there are several areas where the phrasing could be clearer, and the grammar could be refined. Some sentences are overly long or slightly awkward, which can hinder readability. I recommend revising for conciseness, improving sentence structure, and correcting minor grammatical issues to enhance the overall flow and make the manuscript more professional and suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript addresses an important topic in data security, specifically focusing on securing OTPs using the RSA algorithm in a film bank application. The study's practical implementation and experimental testing, including the use of the avalanche effect and black-box testing, demonstrate the system's effectiveness. However, there are areas that could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Structure and Clarity: The manuscript would benefit from clearer subsection divisions and more concise writing. This would enhance the readability and flow of the document. References: The references are outdated and insufficient. Adding more recent and relevant studies will improve the credibility and relevance of the research. Technical Comparisons: Including comparisons with alternative cryptographic algorithms or techniques would strengthen the paper's technical depth. Language: While the language is mostly understandable, refining sentence structures and grammar will make the manuscript more suitable for scholarly publication. <p>In summary, the paper is a solid contribution, but revisions are needed to enhance its scholarly rigor, clarity, and technical robustness.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kwizera K Jonath
Department, University & Country	Central South University, China