

Review of: "Maintaining cyberhygiene in the Internet of Things (IoT): An expert consensus study of requisite user behaviours"

Summera Nosheen¹

¹ University of Sydney

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- A review study on "Maintaining cyberhygiene in the Internet of Things (IoT): An expert consensus study of requisite user behaviors" is provided. Overall, the review study is well written —the method of study design, and other critical parameters of how participants were selected have been adequately given. However, in some quantitative analyses, no censuses have been reached, such as "Not changing the default password" was the only risk behaviour for which experts reached a consensus.
- A large and more comprehensive data set is required to reach a definite census.
- It has not been provided at the end of the Introduction section to show why this evaluation study was conducted and what are the benefits and advancements compared to studies already published in the literature.
- Define acronyms of IQR used in 'Delphi Round Two' and Table 2.
- A reference and proper introduction are required for the snowball recruitment technique. The 'Method- Procedure' section currently provides no reference or definition.
- New key performance indicators (KPIs) needed to be identified for IoT protective and safety behaviours instead of using different Ranks.
- All references used in the study are outdated; the articles used to be revised with recent references. Especially, Beautelement et al. 2009, Iqbal & Pison-Young, 2009; Hadnagy, 2010; Dilmeri et al., 2011; Michie *et al.*, 2011; and Tversky & Kahneman 1973 are more than ten years old studies.