

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>	<p>This manuscript offers valuable insights into the intersection of cybersecurity and operational technology (OT), a rapidly evolving area of research with significant implications for industries such as manufacturing, energy, and transportation. By combining qualitative and quantitative methods, the study provides a robust framework for understanding and prioritizing customer requirements in the development of OT digital twin software. The use of a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) adds a practical dimension to the findings, making it especially useful for companies looking to improve OT security. I appreciate the manuscript's detailed approach to the development process, particularly its focus on real-world applications and expert feedback, which enhances its relevance to both academia and industry. However, the limitations, such as the small sample size and the reliance on relative rather than absolute benefit points, could be seen as areas for improvement in future research.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">No</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it combines qualitative insights from expert interviews with a</p>	

<p>do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>quantitative cost-benefit analysis to evaluate customer requirements for OT digital twin software. The research is grounded in established cybersecurity frameworks like NIST, ensuring its relevance to both academic and industry standards. The methodology, which includes real-world expert feedback and a user profile canvas, provides a practical and data-driven approach to addressing cybersecurity challenges in OT networks.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>Thank you for the clarification. Here's the revised version with your suggested changes at the start: The references in the manuscript are not sufficient. While they are generally relevant to the topics of operational technology (OT), cybersecurity, and product management methods, some are outdated, and important studies are missing. Key frameworks like NIST and ISACA are appropriately cited, providing a solid theoretical foundation. However, to ensure the manuscript reflects the latest advancements, more recent research should be included, particularly in the areas of OT cybersecurity, IT/OT convergence, and customer-centric development processes. Updating the references with studies from the past 2-3 years would enhance the manuscript's relevance and academic rigor.</p>	

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article need to be improved. While the manuscript is generally clear and coherent, there are areas where the phrasing could be refined for better clarity and precision, particularly in technical explanations and complex sentences. Minor grammatical issues and inconsistencies in style and tone should also be addressed to enhance readability and ensure the manuscript meets the standards expected for scholarly communication.\</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. Missing References One of the major issues with the paper is the lack of proper citations. Several key statements and claims are made without sufficient support from existing research. It is essential to provide citations to relevant works that have addressed similar topics or methodologies. This will not only strengthen the paper's credibility but also show how it contributes to the ongoing academic discourse.</p> <p>2. Objectives The paper does not clearly state the research objectives. A well-defined set of objectives is crucial to guide the reader through the research process and help clarify the paper's aims and scope. I recommend including a concise statement of the research objectives at the beginning of the paper to set the context for the reader and outline the specific goals of the study.</p> <p>3. Research Gap The paper lacks an explicit discussion of the research gap. Identifying the gap in the existing literature is essential to justify the importance of the study. This gap should be clearly articulated, explaining what is missing in current research and how your study addresses this gap. This section should outline the specific area that your study aims to contribute to and highlight why this contribution is significant.</p> <p>4. Study Relevance While the paper touches on important issues, the relevance of this research to the broader academic or practical field is not well established. It is important to explain why the research</p>	

	<p>matters and how it can influence current theory, practice, or future studies. A clear statement of relevance will help demonstrate the impact of the study within its academic domain and show its potential applications or broader implications.</p> <p>5. Absence of Current Literature</p> <p>The paper also lacks engagement with the current literature in many sections. Several important studies and advancements in the field seem to be missing. It is crucial to address recent work to contextualize the research properly and demonstrate awareness of current developments. Without this, the paper risks appearing outdated or disconnected from the field's latest trends and findings. I recommend a thorough review of the literature to include up-to-date sources.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include references to recent and relevant studies in all sections where claims are made. • Consider updating the literature review section to reflect the latest developments in the field. • Ensure that every major claim is backed up by appropriate citations from credible sources. • Clearly state the research objectives at the beginning of the paper. • Identify and elaborate on the research gap. • Explicitly discuss the relevance of your study and its potential impact. <p>While the paper shows potential and addresses an important topic, these gaps in referencing, objectives, research gap identification, and relevance need to be addressed for the paper to meet academic standards. I recommend major revisions before resubmission.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <i>(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)</i></p>
--	----------------------------------	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mudasir Ahmad Tass
Department, University & Country	University of Kashmir, India