

Review Form 2

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is a significant contribution to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive examination of various security evaluation standards and practices. By detailing the Common Criteria, FIPS, TCSEC, and ITSEC frameworks, it offers valuable insights into the methodologies used to assess IT-security products. The manuscript's focus on practical steps and the roles of key stakeholders, such as security evaluators and certification bodies, enhances its utility for both practitioners and researchers. Additionally, the inclusion of current standards like PCI DSS 4.0 underscores its relevance in addressing contemporary security challenges. Overall, this manuscript is a valuable resource for understanding and implementing robust security evaluation processes, making it a noteworthy addition to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable. It effectively conveys the manuscript's emphasis on evaluating IT-security products.	
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.	Write it in a short paragraph of 3 sentences.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and structure are generally appropriate, as they provide a logical flow from the introduction of key concepts in security evaluation to detailed discussions on standards and practical steps. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more distinct separation between theoretical explanations and practical applications to enhance readability. Adding clearer headings or subheadings to differentiate between discussions on evaluation standards, practical steps, and the roles of evaluators and certification bodies would improve the organization. Additionally, including a summary or synthesis section to connect the various elements and emphasize their interrelation might provide a more cohesive structure.	

Review Form 2

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by thoroughly analyzing established security evaluation standards such as Common Criteria, FIPS, TCSEC, and ITSEC. It accurately outlines the core elements of security evaluation—functionality, effectiveness, and assurance—while providing practical steps and detailed explanations of evaluation processes. The inclusion of specific examples and standards, such as EAL ratings and PCI DSS 4.0 compliance, further underscores its technical credibility. The references to up-to-date sources and established methodologies indicate a well-researched and reliable manuscript.	
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 provide a solid foundation, covering key standards and concepts relevant to IT security evaluation. However, some of the references are dated, and including more recent publications could enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth. For instance, more recent studies on evolving security threats and advanced evaluation methodologies would be beneficial.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from some refinement. There are occasional instances of awkward phrasing and grammatical inconsistencies that may impact readability and clarity. For example: 1. Under the 'Basic elements of security evaluation' section— "If the manufacturer can guarantee that the product will have enough(use sufficient instead) functionality and effectiveness, then the chance of buying the product is high. (..the chance of purchasing the product increases)" 2. Under 'roles in the evaluation process' section— "The important thing to note is that it is essential for a security evaluator to minimize the costs of the security evaluation process without affecting the evaluation value." Instead can be written as- (It is crucial for security evaluatorsto..) 3. Under 'Evaluation standards' section— "During product development, most organizations claim that their product has enough security, and it has become a tedious task to prove the same, especially for small businesses." Instead can be written as- (During product development, organizations often claim their products are secure, which can be challenging to substantiate small businesses)	
Optional/General comments	Improve the overall flow of the manuscript by ensuring that each section transitions smoothly to the next. Adding brief introductory and concluding statements at the beginning and end of major sections could help guide the reader through the content more effectively.	

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:	Sravanthi Dontu
Department, University & Country	University of The Cumberlands, Unites States of America