

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_123509</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comprehensive Review of Robust Forensic Evidence Collection Techniques in IoT Ecosystems</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	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Grammatical corrections recommended, found a few instances with grammatical errors. 2. Author has selected very good number of papers for literature review, however a few solid papers with the advanced methodologies are missing. 3. The proposed method for collecting digital evidence from IoT device (as in fig 7) doesn't seem to be a new one, as it is already in practice. What is new in it? And what advantages are there for the recommendation? Author has to detail that. 4. Since it is a literature survey paper, it should clearly identify the gap after analysis of existing systems and the problem identified should be mentioned.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jayakrishnan Anilakkad Raman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bharathiar University, India</b>