

Review Form2

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2473
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Security: A Critical Evaluation process for IT-Security Products
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a critical area in the field of digital security by providing a comprehensive evaluation process for IT-security products. The importance of this work lies in its potential to standardize the assessment of security solutions, ensuring that they meet the necessary criteria to protect against emerging threats. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive methodology and its potential to contribute to the development of more secure IT environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Digital Security: A Critical Evaluation Process for IT-Security Products" is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the manuscript.	
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 of the manuscript provides a general overview of the topic but lacks sufficient detail in certain areas. While it introduces the purpose of the manuscript and the focus on evaluating IT-security products, it could be more comprehensive by including a brief mention of the methodology used in the evaluation process. Additionally, the abstract should highlight the key findings or conclusions derived from the research to give readers a clearer understanding of the manuscript's contributions. I suggest adding these points to strengthen the abstract and make it more informative.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is well-organized, making it easy to follow from start to finish. Each section covers a specific part of the topic, which helps the reader understand the overall flow of the discussion. However, it would be helpful if the different parts of the methodology were broken down further, so readers can easily see how the evaluation process works step by step. Also, making sure that each section is clearly labeled will make it easier for readers to find the information they need. Overall, the structure is good, but small changes could make it even clearer and more straightforward.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by presenting a well-structured evaluation process for IT-security products, grounded in established principles of digital security. The methodology is clearly outlined, and the steps taken to assess the security products are logical and based on sound technical criteria. The research is supported by relevant references, indicating that the authors have thoroughly reviewed existing literature and incorporated current best practices.	
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 adequate and include a variety of relevant sources that support the discussion. They incorporate both foundational research and recent studies, ensuring the manuscript is based on current knowledge from the past 2-3 years.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the article is mostly good for academic writing, but there are some spots where the wording is too casual or informal. These parts should be reworded to sound more professional, which will make the article stronger and more appropriate for scholarly work. For example, the author used words/phrases such as Zero in, makes sense, Be it as it may,is there any use, does not mean that no missing will occur etc.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-organized and thorough but needs clearer language, and a more formal tone. Improve grammar, punctuation, citation style, and integration of examples, and consider adding a summary.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayokunle Akinsanya
Department, University & Country	Bowie State University, United States