

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128138
Title of the Manuscript:	Cybercrime Modus Operandi: Computer Misuses
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper introduces a comprehensive framework for understanding cybercrime modus operandi, including psychological and technical tricks. This is a valuable addition to cybersecurity research. However, the contribution would be more impactful with empirical validation or real-world case applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Cybercrime Modus Operandi: Computer Misuses" is relevant and clearly conveys the focus on cybercrime tactics. However, "Computer Misuses" might be too broad. Consider specifying a more targeted aspect of cybercrime, such as "Cybercrime Modus Operandi: Techniques and Tactics in Digital Offenses."	
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.	Strengths: The abstract summarizes the study effectively, including the methodology (Systematic Literature Review) and key findings on psychological and technical tricks. Issues: The abstract contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing (e.g., "most of investigators are have limited knowledge"). Consider revising for clarity and professional tone. Additionally, the abstract overemphasizes recommendations; these could be condensed.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Strengths: The manuscript provides a comprehensive exploration of cybercrime modus operandi, detailing psychological and technical tricks used in cyberattacks. The study employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) methodology, which is scientifically robust for synthesizing data. The eight-stage cybercrime model is well-structured and logical, contributing to the field. Weaknesses: While the conceptual framework is strong, the findings lack empirical validation. The reliance solely on SLR without integrating case studies or primary data reduces the strength of the conclusions. Minor inaccuracies and oversimplifications in describing technical aspects, such as cybersecurity tools, detract from scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	sufficiency: The manuscript includes a variety of sources, including journal articles, books, and reports. However, it heavily cites older references (e.g., from 2013-2017) for foundational concepts, which could be updated with recent advancements in cybersecurity techniques. Recency: While there are some recent references (2023-2024), these are limited primarily to general cybersecurity trends. Adding more recent, peer-reviewed studies on specific cybercrime tactics (e.g., ransomware, social engineering) would enhance the paper's relevance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions for Additional References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Studies on evolving phishing tactics and machine-learning-based detection methods. ○ Reports on the impact of multi-factor authentication (MFA) in mitigating cyberattacks. ○ Recent academic work on zero-day vulnerabilities and advanced persistent threats (APTs). 	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitability for Scholarly Communication: The manuscript contains significant grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and redundancies (e.g., "most of investigators are have limited knowledge"). The tone is sometimes informal, which is unsuitable for a scholarly article. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conduct a thorough grammatical and stylistic revision to ensure clarity and professionalism.• Replace repetitive statements with concise summaries.• Adopt formal scholarly terminology, particularly in the discussion and conclusion sections.	
Optional/General comments	The paper has strong potential, but it requires improvements in grammar, clarity, and empirical grounding. Addressing these issues will make it suitable for publication.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pragati Jain
Department, University & Country	Swami Vivekanand Subharti University, India