

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_126308
Title of the Manuscript:	CYBER SECURITY IN PETROLEUM INDUSTRY: A REVIEW OF THREATS AND COUNTER MEASURES
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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>
<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>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title, "Cyber Security in Petroleum Industry: A Review of Threats and Counter Measures," is mostly suitable but could be refined for clarity. A suggested alternative might be: "Cybersecurity Challenges and Countermeasures in the Petroleum Industry: A Comprehensive Review." This version more clearly emphasizes the review nature of the paper and underscores its comprehensive approach.	
<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>	The abstract is comprehensive, covering the significance of cybersecurity in the petroleum sector, the nature of the threats, and the countermeasures. However, it could benefit from a clearer mention of specific findings, such as the effectiveness of advanced technologies like AI and machine learning. Including these specifics would provide readers with a better understanding of the study's key takeaways.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The structure is generally logical, with sections on digital transformation, threat analysis, and countermeasures. However, the flow would benefit from additional subsections to improve readability, particularly within the threat and countermeasure discussions. Breaking down threats and countermeasures into more detailed, categorized subsections would enhance clarity and allow readers to locate information more easily.	
<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>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and well-supported by references, covering both foundational and advanced topics in cybersecurity within the petroleum industry. The examination of cyber threats and the recommended countermeasures are aligned with current industry standards, making the paper both technically sound and practical for application. The inclusion of real-world examples and recent incidents adds credibility, highlighting the relevance of these issues to the petroleum industry.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The referencing was badly done. The manual has no specific reference style in the entire. The authors should use referencing tools like Endnote, or Mendeley.	

### 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><b>Major Revision Comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Language and Readability:</b> The language is generally clear, but some sections contain redundancy and could be streamlined to improve readability.</li><li>2. <b>Formatting:</b> The manuscript would benefit from consistent formatting in tables and figures, which would improve visual appeal and reader engagement. The entire document is not number and does not subscribe to a standard journal article template</li></ol> <p><b>English Quality</b></p> <p>The English is suitable for scholarly communication, though minor grammar and phrasing improvements would enhance clarity. Proofreading for redundancy and structure is recommended to ensure a polished presentation.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### **PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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:**

Name:	Lukumba Phiri
Department, University & Country	University of Zambia, Zambia