

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_123509
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Review of Robust Forensic Evidence Collection Techniques in IoT Ecosystems
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, titled "A Comprehensive Review of Robust Forensic Evidence Collection Techniques in IoT Ecosystems," is highly significant for the scientific community. It addresses the critical and evolving challenges in digital forensics posed by the proliferation of IoT devices, offering a systematic literature review to identify gaps and propose solutions. The study's strategic recommendations for developing robust forensic methods are particularly valuable, as they aim to enhance data integrity and accommodate the diverse nature of IoT devices. I appreciate the manuscript's thorough analysis and practical applicability, which can significantly contribute to more reliable and effective forensic investigations in the rapidly advancing IoT landscape.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "A Comprehensive Review of Robust Forensic Evidence Collection Techniques in IoT Ecosystems," is quite suitable as it clearly conveys the scope and focus of the manuscript.</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 of the article is quite comprehensive and effectively outlines the key points of the research.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured and includes appropriate subsections that logically flow from one to the next.</p> <p>Abstract: Already comprehensive, but ensure it succinctly summarizes the key findings and contributions.</p> <p>Keywords: These are appropriate and relevant.</p> <p>Introduction: Well-written, providing a good overview of the topic and setting the stage for the rest of the paper.</p> <p>Literature Review: Consider adding a brief summary at the end of each subsection to highlight the key points. Ensure that each subsection logically leads into the next.</p> <p>Methodology: The subsections are well-defined. Ensure that each step is clearly explained and justified.</p> <p>Results: The structure is clear and addresses the research questions directly.</p> <p>Conclusion: Ensure it not only summarizes the findings but also discusses the implications, limitations, and potential future research directions.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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 scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive and systematic approach to reviewing forensic evidence collection techniques in IoT ecosystems. By employing a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology, the authors ensure a thorough and unbiased analysis of existing research, identifying gaps and proposing well-founded solutions. The manuscript's detailed examination of challenges, methodologies, and best practices in IoT forensics demonstrates a deep understanding of the subject matter. Additionally, the inclusion of strategic recommendations and future research directions highlights the manuscript's contribution to advancing the field of digital forensics in IoT environments.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies and sources from 2013 to 2024. This ensures that the manuscript is well-supported by current and authoritative research in the field of IoT forensics.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and coherent sentences that effectively convey the research findings and discussions. However, there are a few areas where minor improvements could enhance readability and clarity.</p> <p>Consistency Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript. For example, “Internet of Things” should consistently be referred to as “IoT” after its first mention.</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax While the grammar is mostly correct, there are occasional awkward phrasings and minor grammatical errors that could be refined. For instance, “Internet of Things main agenda” should be “The main agenda of the Internet of Things.”</p> <p>Complex Sentences Some sentences are quite long and complex. Breaking them into shorter sentences could improve readability. For example, the sentence in the abstract could be split for better clarity.</p> <p>Technical Terms Ensure that all technical terms are clearly defined when first introduced to aid readers who may not be familiar with them.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Kalpa Kalhara Sampath Kotte Kankanamge
Department, University & Country	Sri Lanka

Review Form 3