

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJPAS_122852  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>AWARENESS OF COMMERCE POST GRADUATE STUDENTS ON CYBER CRIME AND CYBER SECURITY IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT</b> |
| 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**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                         | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (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>                        | write in points<br><br>1.                         |   |
| <b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>  | <b>yes</b>  |   |
| <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>   | -   |   |
| <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  | -   |   |
| <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> | -   |   |
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>   | Reference should be updated between years 2020-24 |   |

**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>-</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - The paper clearly articulates the research objective, making the study's purpose and goals easy to understand.</li> <li>2. The research methodology is well-designed, with appropriate sampling, data collection, and analysis techniques, ensuring reliable and valid results.</li> <li>3. The paper provides a thorough review of existing literature, effectively situating the research within the broader academic discourse and highlighting gaps in current knowledge.</li> <li>4. The study yields significant findings that contribute to understanding cybercrime and cybersecurity awareness among postgraduate students, offering valuable insights for educational policies and practices.</li> <li>5. The paper does not adequately integrate a theoretical framework, weakening its ability to contextualize findings within existing theories.</li> <li>6. The paper lacks a detailed discussion of the study's limitations, which is crucial for providing a balanced interpretation of the results.</li> <li>7. The paper relies heavily on descriptive statistics without deeper inferential analysis or discussion of practical implications, limiting the depth of its conclusions.</li> <li>8. There are formatting inconsistencies and language errors that detract from the paper's readability and professionalism, requiring improvements for better presentation and adherence to publication guidelines.</li> <li>9. Reference should be updated between years 2020-24</li> </ol> |  |

**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><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> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Name:</p>                                | <p>K.Ravichandran</p>                                   |
| <p>Department, University &amp; Country</p> | <p>DR MGR Educational and Research Institute, India</p> |