



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31760
Title of the Manuscript:	Implications on Privacy and Forensics on Current Browsers
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are very few references for this journal article – only 13. The user should at least add more references to bring the number up to 30. Most of this can be accomplished in the Literature Review section.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1 - Change WWW in the abstract to full word – avoid using abbreviation first without stating what the word is in full. 2 – Avoid citing authors like, “According to [3]”, instead write the full names of the authors, for example, “According to John and Jane 2017, x plus y is equal to 13 [3]”, then you can include the reference number. 3- In your literature review include a section or paragraph about Browser History. You hardly mentioned that in the article. It is not just IP addresses that are used to track the user browsing behaviour to make a prediction but the browsing logs are constantly mined in what Google terms as “to improve your browsing experience”. 4 – Include literature on User Intent and how it relates to your discussion. This is an important aspect in web search privacy. 5 – I was also expecting some talk about VPS and other web-based browser systems that obfuscate , such as DuckDuckgo and Tor. Just mention these in	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	your literature review. 6 – Mention something about the Web search logs – this is related to browsing history and could be talked about in the same section. 7 – While this paper highlights the privacy and forensic concerns in current web browsers, it would be good to include a proposed privacy mechanism. You included an experiment but it would be interesting to see how those numbers affect the stats collected by Google in the chrome://predictor.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kato Mivule
Department, University & Country	Department of Computer Science, Norfolk State University, Norfolk, USA