

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_131198
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Effectiveness of Cybersecurity Frameworks in Mitigating Cyberattacks in the Banking Sector and Its Applicability to Decentralized Finance (DeFi)
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it contends an issue that is pertinent in the contemporary world, which is cybersecurity, particularly in the domains of banking. This investigation works towards a better understanding and assessment of the frameworks put in place to tackle cyberattacks by evaluating how effective these cybersecurity frameworks are. This study also analyzes the applicability of these frameworks to the upcoming decentralized finance (DeFi) sphere which is becoming more relevant in contemporary finance. Those results could help inform further research and stronger cyber security approaches in both centralized and decentralized financial systems.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, I believe the title is correct because it properly embodies the manuscripts focus which is on assessing some cybersecurity framework components in the banking industry and within DeFi. It is also useful for readers to understand the issues being covered. On the other hand, it is possible to propose an alternative title like: "Assessing Cybersecurity Frameworks for Defending Against Cyberattacks on Banking and DeFi Systems" that is lacking in detail.	OK
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.	Overall, the abstract is quite detailed because it describes two aspects of the study such as evaluating the effectiveness of the cybersecurity frameworks and their functionality in the banking sector and decentral finance. On the negative side, I feel that there must be a short description of the critical results or the overall conclusion of the work. Lastly, the abstract could have taken the form of conclusion without outlining critical pieces of analysis of the research which is needed.	Revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, based on how everything has been laid out, the manuscript seems to be correct scientific work. The methodology section on evaluating the effectiveness of the cyber security frameworks, as provided in the manuscript is lucid, and its application to the banking industry and also to decentralized finance (DeFi) is very clear. The paper utilizes pre-existing frameworks and coherently resolves the contemporary issues of cybersecurity in a rational manner. Nevertheless, it would be good to verify that all types of citations and references are relevant as well as updated.	Effectuated
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and address the essentials of the framework, especially in its application to the banking industry as well as to decentralized finance (DeFi). However, there is a gap of newer studies or reports that discuss advanced trends in cyber security or recent cyber-attacks in these two industries. A gap is also the research and case studies on cyber security in DeFi, which, if added, would reinforce the manuscript greatly.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is clear in presenting ideas and therefore the language and English quality of the article makes it adequate for scholarly communication. Overall, the writing covers all parts and the concepts are articulated clearly. There are likely to be minor areas of concern regarding sentence construction/layout and flow of thoughts for easy understanding some parts, but by and large, the manuscript is clear and well for academic readership.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	