

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	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.	This manuscript looks at cybersecurity in both traditional banks and decentralized finance (DeFi), which is becoming more common. With increasing cyber threats, the research offers ideas on how to strengthen security for both types of systems. It uses techniques like logistic regression and Chi-Square tests to make the results more reliable. The study helps policymakers, financial institutions, and cybersecurity experts find weak spots in current security and suggests solutions, like using AI to detect threats and updating rules for better protection.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Assessing the Effectiveness of Cybersecurity Frameworks in Mitigating Cyberattacks in the Banking Sector and Its Applicability to Decentralized Finance (DeFi)," is clear but a bit long. A shorter version could be: "Evaluating Cybersecurity Frameworks: Effectiveness in Banking and Adaptability to DeFi." The abstract effectively summarizes the study's purpose, methods, findings, and suggestions, clearly explaining cybersecurity in both banking and DeFi. The use of statistical data like p-values and F-statistics adds credibility. Overall, the abstract is well-organized and easy to understand.	

Review Form 3

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.	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is well-organized and clearly explains the study’s goals, methods, main findings, and recommendations. It does a good job showing how cybersecurity frameworks work in traditional banking and how they apply to Decentralized Finance (DeFi). The use of statistical results, like p-values and F-statistics, makes the study more credible and shows that it’s based on solid data.</p> <p>Some suggestions for improvement include adding a brief mention of where the data came from (such as financial reports and cybersecurity incident databases) and explaining one of the findings about how bigger IT budgets can sometimes lead to more cyberattacks. It could also end with a stronger statement, like emphasizing the need for updated regulations and AI-based security models to better protect against financial cyber threats.</p>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript provides a thorough study on how cybersecurity frameworks protect banks and their relevance to Decentralized Finance (DeFi). It uses strong methods like logistic regression, ANOVA, and ARIMA modeling to support its conclusions. The research clearly compares the cybersecurity risks in traditional banking and DeFi, making it highly relevant.</p> <p>Strengths include clear objectives, strong methodology, and a detailed review of cybersecurity frameworks. However, it could improve by explaining why higher IT security budgets sometimes lead to more cyberattacks and by discussing the limitations of current frameworks for DeFi. Expanding on AI’s role in cybersecurity and potential regulatory frameworks for DeFi would also be useful. With a few revisions, the manuscript will make a valuable contribution to cybersecurity research.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The manuscript has a strong set of up-to-date references, mostly from 2022-2024, covering key topics like cybersecurity frameworks and DeFi risks. However, it could include more peer-reviewed sources on AI-driven cybersecurity, DeFi regulations, and the financial impact of cybersecurity breaches. Adding these would strengthen the study further.</p>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The manuscript is well-written, but minor revisions are needed for clarity, consistency, and grammar.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript offers a thorough analysis of cybersecurity frameworks in banking and DeFi. With minor revisions, such as clearer statistical explanations and improved visuals, it will be even more impactful.</p>	

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:	Hirenkumar Mistry
Department, University & Country	USA