

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	Research Paper

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>The manuscript has many positives. The Manuscript provides a study of the cybercrime and cybersecurity awareness of Postgraduate Commerce students in the Coimbatore District. The research was conducted on a specific niche population where there is a research gap. The study analyzed the data using various dimensions and categorical groups, providing deeper insight. The article provides useful and actionable suggestions based on the results.</p> <p>The manuscript has many negatives as well. The article is poorly written. There are too many gaps in the write-up that confuse the reader. The author does not provide extensive and logical discussions or justifications. There are not enough references, and the majority of the references are not recent (less than five years). Therefore, the manuscript is not academically robust and needs more work.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is unsuitable. More suitable titles would be</p> <p>“Cybersecurity and cybercrime awareness among Postgraduate Commerce students in Coimbatore District: A quantitative study”</p> <p>“Quantitative assessment of the cybersecurity and cybercrime awareness among Postgraduate Commerce students in the Coimbatore District”</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 study design in the abstract does not describe the actual study's design. It needs to state whether it was quantitative, qualitative, or mixed and provide a short overview of the factors assessed</p> <p>The methodology needs to be rewritten to be more expressive and academic. It should state the sample, sample size, survey methodology, the factors measured, and the statistics used to assess the factors.</p> <p>The result section is missing in the abstract and should be added.</p> <p>The conclusion is poorly stated and not academic. The conclusion should concisely summarize the results and its implications.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The introduction is too short and is not adequately developed. It does not give an idea of the background that leads to the need for the research.</p> <p>There is no background provided. There are no definitions of terms used or the factors measured. What is cybercrime? What is awareness? How is awareness measured in literature? What theories are available around the topic?</p> <p>The review of the literature should have a flow. The author needs to build a discussion around the literature to help readers understand the topic, trends, and previous research work. The author needs to demonstrate the need for the research. What knowledge gap is the research going to fill?</p> <p>Both the statement of the problem section and the “aim and purpose” section can be combined into the introduction section to give readers a quick and better understanding of the problem the research is addressing.</p> <p>In the Hypothesis subsection, a concise discussion must be written before the Hypotheses are stated. The author should provide a discussion logically leading to and justifying the hypothesis being listed. Also, the hypotheses should be numbered, e.g., H1, H2...</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>The research methodology section is too short. The full methodology should be stated. The “Data and Measures” section can be combined into the discussion for research methodology. This section should state the factors measured and the quantitative method used. Justify the statistical methods used. There is no clear description of the key and central data. What are the factors being measured? How are they measured in the study? What scale is used to measure? How will the results be interpreted?</p> <p>The Sampling design section should be a subsection of the research methodology. The sampling design section also needs to be well developed. Who are the population? Where are they located? Why were they chosen? What were the inclusion/exclusion criteria? What type of sampling was used and why? How was the sample surveyed? What was the design of the question type on the survey form? How was quality assured and bias avoided in the sampling methodology?</p> <p>The subsection “inferencing and anatomy” is poorly termed. It should be “results.” Place the discussion around the results to guide the reader before showing the table.</p> <p>Provide a summary of the results of the hypothesis testing in a tabular form.</p> <p>The “Findings of the Study” section should be renamed “Discussion” and presented as an academic discussion rather than bullet points.</p> <p>The Section “Suggestions of the study” should be named “Recommendations”. This section should also be developed and put in discussion format. Refer to the results to justify each recommendation.</p> <p>References should follow the template formatting.</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>The paper is not yet academically robust, although the statistical methods utilized fit the hypothesis being tested. Many details are missing in the paper that would have added to its robustness. There is not enough discussion in the sections. A lot of work still needs to be done to achieve robustness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>More references are needed. The references are not recent. The author needs to refer to more recent literature.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are grammatical errors which need to be corrected. “Internet consumption a growingly significant aspect of modern life,” “The internet becomes a staple in our life because it provides us joy and happiness, but it can also be a nightmare”</p> <p>The use of “Everyone” is not logical and academic.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Needs more work</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:	Wisdom Umeugo
Department, University & Country	University of the Cumberlands, Canada