

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_122852
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS OF COMMERCE POST GRADUATE STUDENTS ON CYBER CRIME AND CYBER SECURITY IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT
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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Review Comments on the Manuscript: Awareness of Commerce Post Graduate Students on Cyber Crime and Cyber Security in Coimbatore District.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract is generally well-composed. However, the study design and conclusion sections require enhancement. The conclusion should clearly state the study's findings and highlight any innovative aspects of the research.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction is adequately analyzed but would benefit from significant enhancement. The author(s) should incorporate the most recent in-text citations to support the context and relevance of the study.</p> <p>Review of Literature: The literature review is comprehensive, utilizing many references. However, the author(s) must present their interpretation of the findings from the existing literature. Additionally, this section should be updated with references from the past five years to reflect the most current research.</p> <p>Hypothesis: The hypotheses are well-structured, but the author(s) should review and assign letters to each hypothesis, such as H1 for Hypothesis 1, to improve clarity.</p> <p>Data and Measures: This section is well-written, but the source of the questionnaire items is not adequately cited. The author(s) should clearly indicate where the questionnaire items were sourced from and reference the official websites and publications mentioned.</p> <p>Sampling Design: The analysis provided is brief and lacks details regarding data privacy. It is crucial to mention whether the 178 respondents gave informed consent to participate freely in the survey.</p> <p>Inferencing and Analysis Section: Table 1, which enumerates participant profiles, is well-designed, but the analysis lacks detail. The author(s) should provide a more in-depth analysis to improve clarity. Tables 2 to 8 should be reanalyzed to present a coherent picture of the findings.</p> <p>Test of Differences (Tables 9-11): Tables 9, 10, and 11 should present the findings by examining each construct (e.g., cloud security, endpoint security, mobile security, IoT security, password attack, application security, and zero trust security) to provide a comprehensive view based on the research findings.</p> <p>Findings of the Study: The findings are well-presented but should be structured in paragraph form, offering a more detailed analysis aligned with the study's aims and objectives. The author(s) should clearly state which hypotheses were accepted or rejected, possibly presenting this in a table format.</p> <p>Suggestions of the Study: The suggestions are well-written but should be reformatted into paragraph form for better readability.</p> <p>Conclusion: While the conclusion is generally well-written, it should be revised to reflect the study's aims and objectives better considering the research findings.</p> <p>References: The reference list is insufficient, with too few sources cited. At least twenty recent references should be added to strengthen the paper's credibility.</p> <p>Language: The grammar and readability of the manuscript should be reviewed to ensure clarity and accessibility for the research community.</p> <p>Decision: Accept with a MAJOR REVISION.</p>	

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:	Ibrahim Abdulai Sawaneh
Department, University & Country	Sierra Leone