

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	Review 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	No research contribution, Literature review is not describing work done in the IOT forensic domain. Methodology states how authors studied the subject, and not any methodology adopted in forensic domain. No research contribution, Literature review is not describing work done in the IOT forensic domain. Methodology states how authors studied the subject, and not any methodology adopted in forensic domain.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, No techniques related to forensic(IoT forensic /Digital forensic) are mentioned in the paper. No, No techniques related to forensic(IoT forensic /Digital forensic) are mentioned in the paper.	
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.	Abstract proposes more than the contents in the paper	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structure is as per standard paper, but contents are not up to the mark	
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.	Citations are missing. Current methodologies, tools techniques are not described. Summary of articles studied are not describing work done in the past, their comparison in terms of tools used techniques applied.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References mentioned are sufficient , but they must be discussed correctly in the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language not up to the mark, Eg: In 3.1 line 1 of paragraph 1 and 2	
Optional/General comments	Not recommended	

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:	P.S. Joshi
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, India