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 study presents a deep empirical analysis of cybersecurity frameworks in traditional banking and their applicability to the emerging Decentralized Finance (DeFi) sector. It offers statistical validation of cybersecurity measures, an approach that is often lacking in cybersecurity policy research. The study is particularly relevant given the increasing frequency of cyberattacks on financial institutions, making its findings critical for regulators, financial institutions, and cybersecurity professionals. The study also enlightens us by comparing centralized and decentralized financial security postures, the paper fills a notable gap in existing literature and provides actionable insights for enhancing cybersecurity resilience across financial ecosystems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Title is good but very lengthy but manageable	
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.	The abstract really covers the core findings, mentioning the current phrasing of p-values (e.g., $p=0.0689$) should specify whether these results are marginally significant or warrant further exploration.: The abstract currently ends with recommendations, but it can be improved by a direct statement on the overall study implications.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Overall, the manuscript is **scientifically sound and well-structured**. The **logistic regression, ANOVA, and clustering analyses** align with standard research methodologies used in cybersecurity and risk assessment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript has **a strong set of references**, covering both traditional banking and DeFi cybersecurity.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language is good as per scholarly standards	
Optional/General comments	**The paper can be improved by explaining The selection of independent variables in logistic regression, particularly regulatory fines, should be better justified. Providing an explanation of why these variables were chosen will strengthen the validity of the study's conclusion**	

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Jabin Geevarghese George**
Department, University & Country	**USA**