

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_130424
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bridging Gaps in Cybersecurity Governance: Leveraging Collaborative Digital Solutions</b>
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>
<b>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.</b>	<b>This manuscript addresses a highly significant topic that is vital for the scientific community. However, its presentation suffers due to its excessive length of 36 pages, which is notably longer than typical for a scientific paper. This length, coupled with a lack of structured format, makes it difficult to follow the progression of ideas and detracts from the clarity of the research. The paper also tends to be repetitive, which further burdens the reader and dilutes the impact of the findings. Streamlining the content and improving the organizational flow would greatly enhance the manuscript's effectiveness and readability</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The current title of the manuscript, '<i>Bridging gaps in cybersecurity governance: leveraging collaborative digital solutions</i>,' while engaging, broadly encapsulates the subject without reflecting the specificity of the content, particularly the focus on certain countries. A more descriptive title could be '<i>Comparative Cybersecurity Challenges: Focus on .....</i>' This revised title immediately informs readers of the geographic focus and the analytical approach of the case studies, thereby aligning more closely with the manuscript's detailed content.</b>	
<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>	<b>The abstract of the manuscript, while informative, reveals extensive details about the study's methodology, findings, and conclusions. This comprehensive disclosure, akin to a movie trailer that reveals too much of the plot, may inadvertently dissuade readers from engaging with the full paper. To maintain reader interest and encourage a thorough exploration of the manuscript, I suggest paring down the abstract to focus on the study's primary objectives, broad methodologies, and a hint at the findings without fully disclosing them. A more concise and enticing abstract will motivate readers to delve into the detailed discussions and analyses presented in the full article.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<b>While the manuscript does tackle scientifically relevant issues within cybersecurity governance, its presentation could be significantly improved to uphold the scientific rigour expected in published research. The current length of the manuscript is excessive, which, combined with repetitive content and a fragmented structure, detracts from its scientific impact. The disjointed flow makes it challenging to trace the logical progression of arguments and key findings. To enhance its scientific correctness, I recommend a thorough revision to condense repetitive sections, improve the overall structure, and present a clearer, more concise argumentation. This would not only shorten the manuscript but also make the scientific contributions more apparent and impactful</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>The references for the manuscript are recent (mostly 2021-2024), however, it is quite noticeable that the studied articles have a rather narrow geographical extension (mostly Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia). I would suggest referencing some articles from Europe, such as: 1. M. Anghel, G.C. Pereteanu (2020) CYBER SECURITY APPROACHES IN E-LEARNING, <i>INTED2020 Proceedings</i>, pp. 4820-4825. 2. Monica BARBU, Alin ZAMFIROIU, Ion Alexandru MARINESCU, Dragos IORDACHE, Robert BUMBAC, "Empowering Digital Education: Understanding Students' Perceptions about Risks and Threats in the Shifting Educational Paradigm", <i>Studies in Informatics and Control</i>, ISSN 1220-1766, vol. 32(4), pp. 105-114, 2023. <a href="https://doi.org/10.24846/v32i4y202310">https://doi.org/10.24846/v32i4y202310</a>.</b>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>3. Andreea DINU, Paul Cristian VASILE, Alexandru GEORGESCU, "AI-driven solutions for cybersecurity: comparative analysis and ethical aspects", Romanian Journal of Information Technology and Automatic Control, ISSN 1220-1758, vol. 34(3), pp. 35-48, 2024. <a href="https://doi.org/10.33436/v34i3y202403">https://doi.org/10.33436/v34i3y202403</a>.</p> <p>4. Florina VEVERA, "Strategic approaches concerning the security risks related to the implementation of the 5G technology and the use of facial recognition systems", Romanian Journal of Information Technology and Automatic Control, ISSN 1220-1758, vol. 30(1), pp. 125-132, 2020. <a href="https://doi.org/10.33436/v30i1y202010">https://doi.org/10.33436/v30i1y202010</a>.</p> <p>5. Dragoş BARBU, Alexandru SIPICĂ, Ionuţ CANDET, "The SLA security issues in cloud computing services", Romanian Journal of Information Technology and Automatic Control, ISSN 1220-1758, vol. 29(3), pp. 31-40, 2019. <a href="https://doi.org/10.33436/v29i3y201903">https://doi.org/10.33436/v29i3y201903</a>.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>The language quality of the manuscript currently falls short of the standard required for scholarly communications. The narrative suffers from some grammatical errors (for example the word “multifaceted” is written in different ways throughout various chapters) and awkward phrasing, which could impede comprehension and distract from the core content of the research. To ensure the manuscript meets the linguistic standards expected in academic publications, it would benefit from a comprehensive review and editing for clarity, coherence, and grammatical accuracy. Enhancing the language quality will not only improve readability but also bolster the credibility and persuasiveness of the research presented. One should also mind the myriad of bombastic words specific to AI assistants: “robust”, “leveraging”, “fostering”, “entails”, etc. <u>It would also be beneficial to employ desktop publishing and have a more structured approach.</u></b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>This manuscript addresses a critical and timely topic within the field of cybersecurity governance, focusing on comparative case studies from Australia and Nigeria. The significance of the research is clear, yet several aspects of the manuscript’s execution require attention to truly meet the publication standards of a scholarly article. The excessive length, repetitive content, and fragmented structure significantly hinder its readability and the clear communication of its findings. Additionally, the language quality needs substantial revision to meet academic standards. Streamlining the content, enhancing the structure, and rigorous language editing could transform this manuscript into a valuable contribution to the cybersecurity field. I encourage the authors to address these points to fully realize the potential of their research.</b></p> <p><b><u>Moreover, for a more comprehensive global perspective concerning the issue that is debated, the author(s) should include Europe in said debate (at least in the introductory part of the paper). Currently, only Australia, Africa, the US and the Middle East are mentioned. It is recommended that any research/study tackle firstly the issue at hand at a global level (including all continents), then move to a regional level and finally zoom in on the case study and focus on a certain part of the globe, as it is clear the author(s) intend(s) to.</u></b></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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Monica Barbu</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>National Institute for Research and Development in Informatics, Romania</b></p>