

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_78684
Title of the Manuscript:	Systematic Literature Review of the Role of Fuzzy Logic in the Development of Cryptographic and Steganographic Techniques
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Novelty part of the paper is not clear. Kindly create a new heading/section, which is "Related work". In this section, include all recent published work and then prepare a table for all possible research gap findings. Then mention that which one research gap has been overcome in this paper. Then validate the presented results that such work has been attempted 1st time in this paper. 2. Kindly include a diagram for proposed approach, which can show whole work done in the paper in form of diagram/flow chart. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the purpose of the proposed method? 2. What are the advantages of the proposed method? 3. Is it possible to identify the new addition that came with the paper? 4. What is the purpose of using fuzzy logic in this paper? Explain more? 5. What are the characteristics of fuzzy logic used? 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A comparative study is necessary between this work and other works. Compare this work with the other works. 2. Information presented in chapter conclusion are rather summary or discussion. It should be totally improved and should contain real conclusions. There is a need to enhance the state-of-the-art of related work. Kindly create a new heading and explain the all possible recent published work of the domain. Then list out the all possible research gap. 3. And also validate the performance of the proposed approach with the literature. 4. In the third paragraph of the introduction, I wrote (password atau kunci [1] Techniques) is better to correct it like this (password atau kunci [1]. Techniques) 5. The introduction should contain 70% of the references. 6. Include another title to the article under the Related works title. 	

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:	Habib Benbouhenni
Department, University & Country	Nisantasi university, Turkey