

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Mathematics and Computer Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOMCOR_12559
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital twin in industrial networks: A cost-benefit analysis in Operational Technology
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

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This paper offers insightful information on the potential and difficulties associated with protecting operational technology (OT) networks. • The information fills a significant vacuum in the area by addressing the low adoption of digital twin technology and suggesting a customer-centric approach for feature development. • Overall, the manuscript contributes meaningfully to advancing cybersecurity and operational excellence in OT environments. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The abstract is informative and captures the key aspects of the study, but there are areas where it could be improved to ensure it is comprehensive and fully aligned with the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Overall, the organization and subsections of the manuscript are adequate.</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>The paper appears scientifically and technically sound because it adheres to known research procedures and use</p>	

minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	reputable frameworks. The study uses authoritative sources, including as NIST and ENISA, to contextualize OT-specific cybersecurity concerns, ensuring that the basic information is legitimate and in line with current industry norms.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are very much sufficient for this paper	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Keerthipati Kumar
Department, University & Country	Sri Venkateswara College of Engineering, India