

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Mathematics and Computer Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOMCOR_12559</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Digital twin in industrial networks: A cost-benefit analysis in Operational Technology</b>
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> ( <i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i> )
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This paper explores the challenges and opportunities of adopting digital twin technologies within Operational Technology (OT) networks. Considering the growing cybersecurity risks in these environments, this research provides valuable insights into customer-driven development strategies. Its structured approach and focus on practical applications make it a meaningful contribution to both academia and industry.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title accurately represents the essence of the manuscript and does not require any modification.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The abstract effectively summarizes the key findings and methods. However, it could be improved by placing greater emphasis on how aligning digital twin features with customer requirements can drive wider adoption. A slight rephrasing in this area would enhance its impact.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-organized, with a clear and logical flow between sections. The structure supports the reader in following the arguments and conclusions effectively.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The methodology, combining qualitative interviews with a cost-benefit analysis (CBA), is thorough and well-justified. The findings are grounded in both theory and practical feedback, which reinforces the manuscript's credibility and value.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references cited are sufficient and up-to-date. There is no immediate need for additional references.</p>	

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is overall clear and professional. However, certain sentences in the abstract and conclusion sections could be refined for smoother readability and to avoid redundancy.</p> <p>Some figures, particularly the cost-benefit analysis chart (Figure 4), could be enhanced for better clarity and visual appeal. Ensure all visuals are adequately labeled and easy to interpret.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript's practical recommendations, especially those aimed at narrowin, are insightful and actionable. These recommendations could serve as a blueprint for other startups seeking to develop customer-centric solutions in the OT domain.</p> <p><i>No ethical concerns were identified in the manuscript.</i></p> <p>No competing interest issues were observed.</p> <p>The work appears original, with no evidence of plagiarism.</p> <p>This manuscript is well-written, methodologically robust, and offers significant contributions. Minor revisions will further enhance its overall quality and readability.</p>	

**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)
<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>Agi Nanjar</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Universitas Amikom Purwokerto, Indonesia</b></p>