

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

Eirini Eleni Tsiropoulou¹

¹ University of New Mexico

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors focus their study on providing a research study regarding the key behaviors and threats within Internet of Things environments. Specifically, the proposed study has followed a multi round approach where at the beginning the experts responses have been collected and categorized into behavioral categories and then the experts rated the importance of the protective behaviors and the likelihood that risk behaviors and threats would lead to Internet of Things breaches.

Furthermore, at the next round of the proposed study the experts were able to reevaluate their responses based on the responses of themselves as well as of the rest of the group that has participated in the study. This is a very interesting research study that to the best of the reviewer's knowledge has not been already performed in the current state-of-the-art. Thus, this reviewer finds the proposed approach very novel and interesting and it can benefit the readers of the journal.

However, this reviewer has several comments for the authors in order to further improve the scientific depth and the quality of presentation of their manuscript. Initially, the authors need to discuss how hardware security approaches that already exist in the literature, e.g., Ad-Hoc, Mobile, and Wireless Networks: 19th International Conference on Ad-Hoc Networks and Wireless, ADHOC-NOW 2020, Bari, Italy, October 19–21, 2020, Proceedings, they can support the functionality and the robustness of Internet of Things environments.

Also, the authors are highly encouraged to include some tables summarizing the main findings of each round of their study in order to be easily understood by the average reader. Furthermore, in the results section, it would be beneficial for the paper if the authors could provide a comparative qualitative discussion to other similar studies that may have been already performed in the literature in order to further improve the scientific depth of the manuscript.

Finally, the overall paper needs to be checked for typos, syntax, and grammar errors in order to improve the quality of its presentation.