

Article DOI: 10.21474/JNCS01/150

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/JNCS01/150>

DIGITAL FORENSICS IN MODERN COMPUTING: INVESTIGATION TECHNIQUES, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Armaan Qureshi and Bhat Sumiya

Corresponding Author: Armaan Qureshi

| ABSTRACT

Digital forensics has become an essential component of modern computing because computers, smartphones, cloud platforms, network infrastructures, and connected devices generate information that may be relevant to security incidents and legal investigations. Digital forensic investigation involves identifying, acquiring, preserving, examining, analysing, and reporting digital evidence while maintaining its integrity and traceability. The rapid development of information technology has expanded the range of potential evidence sources and introduced new technical and procedural challenges. Traditional computer forensics now operates alongside mobile-device, network, memory, cloud, and Internet of Things (IoT) forensics. This paper presents a narrative review of digital forensic investigation techniques, their applications, and their limitations in contemporary computing environments. It examines evidence acquisition, forensic imaging, cryptographic hashing, file-system analysis, timeline reconstruction, memory examination, network-log analysis, and cloud-based investigations. The paper also discusses challenges related to encryption, volatile evidence, distributed data storage, privacy, legal jurisdiction, tool validation, and the increasing volume of digital information. Emerging research directions include artificial intelligence-assisted analysis, standardised evaluation frameworks, automated evidence correlation, cloud forensic readiness, privacy-preserving methods, and improved reproducibility. The review emphasises that reliable digital investigations require technically sound methods, documented procedures, appropriate legal authority, validated tools, and careful interpretation of findings. It concludes that future progress depends on integrating technological innovation with scientific reliability, professional competence, and responsible evidence management.

| KEYWORDS

Digital forensics, digital evidence, computer forensics, mobile forensics, network forensics, cloud computing, forensic investigation, cybersecurity, evidence integrity.

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

RECEIVED: 16 June 2026

ACCEPTED: 20 July 2026

PUBLISHED: August 2026

Introduction:-

Modern society increasingly depends on digital technologies for communication, business operations, financial transactions, education, healthcare, and public services. These activities generate electronic records across computers, smartphones, servers, cloud applications, network devices, and connected systems. Such records may help investigators understand cybersecurity incidents, policy violations, data breaches, fraud, and other events requiring technical examination. Digital forensics is the systematic examination of digital information to establish facts about an event or activity. It combines computer-science techniques with documented investigative procedures to identify, preserve, examine, and interpret potential digital evidence. The discipline aims to produce findings that can be independently reviewed and, where appropriate, considered in legal or organisational proceedings.

The growth of digital services has expanded both the amount and the variety of evidence available to investigators. A single incident may involve local files, application records, system logs, network traffic, cloud-based documents, and information stored on several devices. Investigators must determine which sources are relevant, preserve information appropriately, and distinguish reliable observations from assumptions. Digital evidence also presents distinctive challenges. Information can be modified automatically by operating systems and applications, deleted records may be partially recoverable, and timestamps can be affected by time-zone settings or incorrect device clocks. Cloud systems may distribute information across several

Copyright: © 2026 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Jana Publication and Research LLP.

locations, while encryption and changing software formats can complicate examination. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) reviewed the scientific foundations of digital investigation techniques and highlighted the importance of understanding the limitations of forensic methods and the interpretation of digital artefacts [1]. This makes methodological transparency and careful reporting central to trustworthy digital investigations. This paper reviews established investigation techniques, major forensic domains, practical applications, current challenges, and future research opportunities in modern computing.

Objectives of the Study:-

The principal objectives of this paper are:-

1. To explain the concepts and fundamental stages of digital forensic investigation.
2. To examine commonly used techniques for acquiring, preserving, and analysing digital evidence.
3. To review the major domains of digital forensics in contemporary computing environments.
4. To identify technical, procedural, legal, and ethical challenges affecting investigations.
5. To discuss the role of automation and artificial intelligence in forensic analysis.
6. To identify future research directions that may improve reliability, efficiency, and reproducibility.

Review Methodology:-

This paper adopts a narrative literature-review methodology. It synthesises established publications, technical guidance, and research surveys concerning digital evidence examination, computer forensics, cloud investigations, forensic tool evaluation, and emerging research priorities. The review draws on publications from NIST, research presented in digital-forensics literature, and peer-reviewed surveys addressing investigative techniques and research challenges. The selected material is organised into themes covering investigative procedures, forensic domains, technical limitations, and future developments. The paper does not report a new experiment, conduct original forensic examinations, or present newly collected empirical data. Consequently, the discussion is qualitative and is intended to provide a structured overview of established methods rather than a quantitative ranking of forensic tools.

Fundamentals of Digital Forensics:-

Definition and Scope:-

Digital forensics is the application of systematic methods to digital information for investigative purposes. Its scope includes identifying relevant data, obtaining information through authorised procedures, preserving its integrity, examining artefacts, reconstructing events, and communicating conclusions. The discipline extends beyond recovering deleted files. Investigators may examine file-system structures, application databases, event logs, system configurations, network records, metadata, and information retained in volatile memory. The relevance of each source depends on the questions being investigated. A sound forensic conclusion must distinguish direct observations from interpretations. For example, the presence of a file on a device may establish that the file was present when examined, but it does not automatically establish who created it, who accessed it, or why it was stored there.

Digital Evidence:-

Digital evidence consists of electronic information that may help establish facts about an event.

Examples include:-

- Documents, images, videos, and other stored files.
- File-system metadata and operating-system records.
- Application databases and communication records.
- Authentication records and access logs.
- Network-flow information and security alerts.
- Memory artefacts and system-process information.
- Cloud-service audit records and synchronisation histories.
- Logs and records generated by connected devices.

Not every artefact is relevant, complete, or reliable. Investigators must consider how information was generated, whether it could have changed, and what conclusions it can reasonably support.

Principles of Reliable Investigation:-

Reliable digital investigations depend on several principles:-

Integrity: Evidence should be protected against unauthorised alteration, and relevant integrity checks should be documented.

Preservation: Investigators should minimise unnecessary changes to the original source and record any unavoidable changes.

Traceability: The origin, collection, handling, transfer, storage, and examination of evidence should be documented.

Repeatability: Methods should be described sufficiently for another qualified examiner to understand and, where possible, reproduce the process.

Objectivity: Examiners should consider alternative explanations and avoid treating a technical observation as proof of a broader claim without supporting evidence.

Proportionality: The scope of examination should be appropriate to the investigative purpose and applicable legal requirements.

These principles help make forensic findings understandable, reviewable, and more defensible.

Stages of Digital Forensic Investigation:-

Identification of Evidence Sources:-

The first stage is to identify potential sources of relevant information. Depending on the incident, these may include workstations, servers, smartphones, removable media, network infrastructure, cloud accounts, or connected devices. Investigators should establish the scope of the examination, identify relevant systems, document their condition, and determine what information may be available. A clear scope reduces unnecessary collection and supports proportionate investigation.

Preservation and Acquisition:-

Preservation aims to maintain the condition and integrity of potential evidence. Acquisition involves obtaining a suitable forensic copy or authorised export of the relevant information. For storage devices, forensic imaging can create a bit-for-bit copy when the medium and circumstances permit it. Some sources, including cloud services and live systems, require different acquisition approaches because a conventional physical image may not be available. The acquisition method should be appropriate to the source. Investigators should record the tools used, relevant settings, acquisition time, errors encountered, and any limitations affecting completeness.

Integrity Verification:-

Cryptographic hash functions can produce a digest associated with a file or forensic image. Comparing hashes before and after a transfer or examination can help determine whether the corresponding data changed. Hash verification is an important integrity check, but its meaning must not be overstated. A matching digest supports the conclusion that the compared data are identical with respect to the hash function and procedure used. It does not independently establish that the original information was authentic, complete, or correctly attributed to a person.

Examination and Analysis:-

Examination identifies relevant information within acquired evidence. Analysis interprets that information in relation to the investigative questions. Examination may include file-system analysis, metadata inspection, searching for relevant terms, reviewing application records, identifying deleted-file remnants, or correlating event logs. Analysis then considers the relationships among the findings and evaluates possible explanations. Investigators should record relevant procedures and distinguish observed facts from interpretations. They should also document limitations, including inaccessible information, damaged data, unsupported file formats, and uncertainty about timestamps.

Reporting and Presentation:-

A forensic report should explain the purpose and scope of the examination, evidence sources, methods, tools, findings, limitations, and conclusions. Important claims should be supported by traceable observations. Reports should use clear language and avoid conclusions that exceed the available evidence. Where uncertainty remains, it should be stated explicitly. A technically accurate report should allow readers to understand both what the examination established and what it could not establish.

Major Digital Forensic Investigation Techniques:-

Disk and File-System Forensics:-

Disk forensics examines information stored on hard drives, solid-state drives, removable storage, and other supported media. Investigators may analyse file systems, directory structures, metadata, partitions, system records, and available remnants of deleted information. File-system artefacts can help establish when files were created, modified, or accessed, subject to the behaviour of the relevant operating system and file system. However, timestamps may be affected by copying, synchronisation, application behaviour, time-zone conversion, or deliberate manipulation. Deleted information may sometimes be recovered when its contents remain available. Recovery is not guaranteed: data may have been overwritten, encrypted, trimmed, or otherwise made inaccessible. A recovered item may also be incomplete or unrelated to the investigated event. Accordingly, disk examination requires careful interpretation of both the available data and the limitations of the storage technology.

Memory Forensics:-

Memory forensics examines information held in a system's volatile memory. Depending on the operating system and the circumstances of acquisition, memory data may contain evidence about running processes, loaded modules, network connections, active sessions, and other runtime activity. Unlike persistent storage, volatile memory can change rapidly and may be lost when a system is shut down. This creates a tension between preserving the current state and minimising interference with the system. Memory analysis can be particularly relevant to incident response, malware investigations, and cases in which important information is not retained in ordinary files. However, interpretation depends on the operating system, memory layout, acquisition method, and analytical tools.

Mobile-Device Forensics:-

Mobile-device forensics examines smartphones, tablets, and related mobile platforms. Potential evidence includes call records, messages, photographs, application data, location-related records, device settings, and system logs. The range of available information depends on the device model, operating system, security settings, encryption, application design, and access permissions. Changes to operating systems and application formats can also affect the interpretation of previously familiar artefacts. Mobile investigations must consider privacy and proportionality because a personal device may contain large amounts of information unrelated to the matter being investigated. Authorised collection should be limited to the relevant scope wherever possible.

Network Forensics:-

Network forensics analyses network traffic, connection records, security alerts, and associated infrastructure logs. It can help investigators reconstruct communication patterns, identify unusual activity, and establish relationships between systems during an incident. Network evidence may come from packet captures, flow records, firewall logs, intrusion-detection systems, DNS records, and authentication services. These sources provide different levels of detail and may have different retention periods. Encryption can limit visibility into communication contents, while missing logs, clock differences, network address translation, and incomplete packet capture can complicate event reconstruction. Consequently, network findings should be correlated with endpoint, server, and application evidence when appropriate.

Cloud Forensics:-

Cloud forensics examines digital evidence associated with cloud infrastructure, hosted applications, remote storage, and cloud-based services. Such environments can distribute information across multiple systems and administrative boundaries. Relevant evidence may include audit logs, access records, file versions, account activity, service configuration, virtual-machine records, and provider-generated metadata. Investigators may need to rely on provider-supported exports and documented administrative processes rather than direct physical access to the underlying hardware. NIST's work on cloud-computing forensics describes the challenges that arise when responding to incidents in cloud ecosystems [2]. These include evidence availability, distributed architecture, provider dependencies, and differences in the responsibilities of customers and service providers. Effective cloud investigations benefit from advance planning, appropriate logging, clear retention policies, and established procedures for obtaining evidence through authorised channels.

Internet of Things Forensics:-

IoT forensics concerns evidence associated with connected devices such as smart appliances, sensors, wearable devices, and industrial monitoring equipment. These devices may generate timestamps, sensor readings, device-state records, network events, and information stored in companion applications or cloud services. However, storage capacity and logging capabilities may be limited, and device manufacturers may use proprietary data formats. An investigation may therefore need to correlate evidence from the device itself, its gateway, associated mobile applications, and remote services. Time synchronisation and data interpretation are especially important when reconstructing activity across multiple devices.

Forensic Tools and Validation:-

Digital forensic tools assist with acquisition, searching, file-system examination, timeline analysis, data recovery, and report generation. Some tools are designed for particular evidence types, while others provide broader investigative functionality. A tool's popularity or commercial status does not by itself establish its suitability for a specific examination. Investigators should understand the tool's capabilities, supported formats, known limitations, and behaviour under relevant conditions. Tool validation is important because software updates, operating-system changes, and new data formats can affect results. Appropriate testing can establish whether a tool performs as expected for a defined task. Independent verification or the use of complementary methods may help assess significant findings. NIST's scientific foundation review highlights the importance of understanding the limitations of forensic techniques and improving methods for evaluating tools and sharing reliable reference data [1]. Forensic reporting should identify the tools and relevant versions used, record important settings, and explain any known limitations that could affect the conclusions.

Applications of Digital Forensics:-

Cybersecurity Incident Response:-

Digital forensics supports investigations of unauthorised access, data breaches, suspicious software activity, and other security incidents. Evidence from endpoints, servers, identity systems, and networks can help establish the scope and timeline of an incident. Forensic findings may also inform remediation and security improvements. Nevertheless, investigators should distinguish evidence that a particular event occurred from evidence about who caused it or whether it was intentional.

Criminal and Civil Investigations:-

Digital evidence may be relevant to criminal investigations, civil disputes, employment matters, and other formal proceedings. Documents, communication records, metadata, and system logs can help establish or challenge accounts of events. The admissibility and weight of evidence depend on the applicable legal framework and the circumstances of collection and examination. Technical analysis should therefore be supported by appropriate authorisation, documentation, and professional review.

Corporate Investigations:-

Organisations may use digital forensics to investigate suspected data exposure, policy violations, unauthorised system changes, and internal security incidents. Such examinations require appropriate access controls and respect for employee and customer privacy. A defined investigative purpose, clear scope, and documented authorisation help reduce unnecessary collection and strengthen accountability.

Fraud and Financial Investigations:-

Digital records can help establish transaction sequences, account access, document changes, and communication histories relevant to suspected fraud. Investigators may correlate records from financial systems, user devices, authentication services, and relevant network logs. A correlation between events does not automatically establish causation or identify a responsible individual. Findings should be interpreted in context and supported by independent evidence where possible.

Major Challenges in Modern Digital Forensics:-

Increasing Volume of Digital Evidence:-

The number of devices, applications, and data sources involved in an investigation can create substantial workloads. Large collections of files and logs increase the time required for triage, examination, and reporting. Automation can help prioritise relevant information, but excessive reliance on automated filtering may overlook unusual or previously unknown evidence. Investigative efficiency should therefore be balanced with completeness and documented limitations.

Encryption and Restricted Access:-

Encryption protects the confidentiality of information but can also limit the availability of evidence to investigators. In some cases, relevant data may remain inaccessible through the available authorised methods. This challenge highlights the importance of lawful access procedures, forensic readiness, and appropriate evidence preservation. It does not justify treating inaccessible data as proof of wrongdoing; conclusions must remain grounded in available evidence.

Rapid Technological Change:-

Operating systems, applications, cloud platforms, and connected devices change frequently. Artefacts may differ between versions, and forensic tools may not immediately support new formats. NIST identifies the changing technological environment as an important limitation because the meaning of digital artefacts may depend on the software that created them [1]. Ongoing training, tool testing, reference datasets, and structured knowledge sharing are therefore necessary.

Distributed and Cloud-Based Evidence:-

Cloud systems can store information across different infrastructure providers, geographic locations, and administrative domains. Relevant records may be distributed across several services, each with distinct retention policies and access procedures. Investigators must consider jurisdiction, provider cooperation, data availability, and the timing of evidence requests. Advance logging and retention planning can reduce the risk of losing relevant records.

Maintaining Evidence Integrity:-

Digital evidence can be altered during ordinary system operation, collection, transfer, or analysis. Poor documentation can also create uncertainty about whether the examined material is the same as the material originally collected. Hash verification, controlled storage, documented handling, appropriate acquisition methods, and reproducible procedures can reduce these risks. Nevertheless, no single integrity check replaces the complete documentation of evidence handling.

Attribution and Interpretation:-

A device or account may contain information associated with a particular activity, but attribution to a person can be difficult. Shared devices, automated processes, compromised accounts, remote access, and synchronisation may create alternative explanations. Forensic conclusions should reflect the strength of the evidence and acknowledge plausible alternatives. Examiners should avoid overstating certainty when the available data support only a limited conclusion.

Privacy and Legal Requirements:-

Digital devices can contain sensitive personal and organisational information unrelated to an investigation. Broad collection may expose private records unnecessarily. Investigators should follow applicable laws, authorisation requirements, institutional policies, and data-protection obligations. Proportionate collection, access restrictions, secure storage, and suitable retention and disposal practices support responsible evidence management.

Skills and Resource Limitations:-

Effective digital forensic work requires knowledge of operating systems, storage technologies, networking, application behaviour, evidence handling, and investigative reasoning. Smaller organisations may face limitations in staffing, specialist equipment, training, and access to validated tools. Professional development, shared training resources, documented procedures, and cooperation among qualified practitioners can help address these limitations.

Artificial Intelligence and Automation in Digital Forensics:-

Artificial intelligence and automation offer opportunities to organise large collections of digital evidence and assist analysts with repetitive tasks. Potential applications include log classification, document grouping, anomaly detection, identification of related events, and prioritisation of records for human review. Automated systems may help identify patterns across multiple evidence sources, but their output requires careful validation. A machine-learning system can produce false positives, miss relevant information, or behave differently when applied to unfamiliar data. AI-generated summaries should remain traceable to the underlying evidence. Investigators should be able to verify important statements against original records and distinguish automated suggestions from independently established findings. Privacy and confidentiality also matter when forensic data are processed by external services. Organisations should assess where evidence is stored, who can access it, and whether the processing arrangement meets legal and professional obligations. AI should therefore be treated as an analytical aid rather than a substitute for validated methods, professional judgement, or accountable reporting.

Future Research Directions:-

Standardised Forensic Evaluation:-

Future research should improve the consistency and transparency of forensic tool testing. Shared reference datasets, documented test cases, repeatable evaluation procedures, and clear reporting of tool limitations could reduce duplicated effort and improve confidence in results. Evaluation should cover not only whether a tool produces an expected output, but also how it behaves with incomplete, corrupted, or unfamiliar data.

Automated Evidence Correlation:-

Investigations increasingly involve evidence from endpoints, cloud services, mobile devices, and networks. Research into automated correlation may help analysts identify relationships among events across different systems. Such methods must account for clock differences, inconsistent identifiers, missing records, and uncertainty. Systems should preserve links to source records so that proposed relationships can be independently checked.

Cloud Forensic Readiness:-

Cloud forensic readiness involves preparing systems and procedures so that relevant evidence can be obtained when an incident occurs. Research can improve the design of audit logging, evidence export, retention planning, and cooperation between service providers and investigators. Future frameworks should consider the different responsibilities of customers and providers, the limitations of available records, and the need for secure and traceable evidence handling.

Privacy-Preserving Investigation:-

Privacy-preserving forensic methods could reduce the exposure of unrelated information during examination. Potential areas include scoped data collection, selective disclosure, controlled access, and improved procedures for managing sensitive records. Research should assess whether these methods preserve the information necessary for the investigation while reducing unnecessary access and retention.

Forensics for Emerging Devices:-

Wearables, smart-home equipment, autonomous systems, and industrial IoT devices are creating new types of digital artefacts. Future research should examine their data formats, timekeeping behaviour, storage limitations, and interactions with mobile

applications and cloud platforms. Shared reference data and validated interpretation methods will be important as new device categories become common sources of evidence.

Explainable and Auditable AI:-

AI-assisted forensic systems should provide transparent explanations of how records were selected, classified, or prioritised. Research should address error rates, uncertainty, reproducibility, and the risk that automated tools may reinforce an investigator's initial assumptions. An auditable system should preserve the provenance of the data used and allow important findings to be verified against source evidence.

Cross-Domain Collaboration:-

Computer, mobile, network, cloud, and IoT forensics often address related problems using different methods. Greater collaboration could help researchers share lessons about evidence integrity, tool validation, timeline reconstruction, and uncertainty. A coordinated research approach may reduce duplication and encourage more consistent practices across forensic domains.

Discussion:-

Digital forensics has evolved from a primarily computer-storage-oriented discipline into a broad field covering multiple interconnected computing environments. Traditional disk examination remains important, but investigations increasingly depend on information from mobile applications, network infrastructure, cloud services, and connected devices. The reviewed literature indicates that the reliability of a forensic investigation depends on more than the technical capability of a tool. Investigators must understand how evidence was generated, how it was acquired, what transformations occurred during analysis, and what conclusions the findings can support. Even established techniques have limitations, particularly when data are incomplete, software has changed, or several interpretations are plausible. Automation can improve efficiency when evidence volumes are large, but it introduces additional requirements for validation, transparency, and human oversight. AI-assisted prioritisation may help investigators focus their work, while unverified automated conclusions can introduce new errors. A balanced approach combines computational assistance with traceable evidence, reproducible procedures, and critical review.

The legal and ethical dimensions of digital forensics are equally important. Evidence may contain information about individuals who are not subjects of the investigation, and cross-border or cloud-based examinations can raise complex questions about access and jurisdiction. Responsible practice requires appropriate authorisation, proportionate collection, and careful handling of sensitive information. Future development should therefore combine technical innovation with stronger evaluation standards, improved knowledge sharing, specialist training, and transparent reporting. These measures can help make digital forensic investigations more reliable and useful across changing computing environments.

Conclusion:-

Digital forensics is a vital discipline for examining digital evidence in modern computing environments. Its methods support cybersecurity incident response, criminal and civil investigations, organisational inquiries, and the analysis of activity across computer systems, mobile devices, networks, cloud platforms, and connected technologies. The principal stages of investigation include evidence identification, preservation, acquisition, integrity verification, examination, analysis, and reporting. Techniques such as forensic imaging, file-system analysis, memory examination, network-log analysis, and cloud-record examination provide complementary sources of information. Their reliability depends on suitable methods, validated tools, careful interpretation, and clear documentation.

Major challenges include growing evidence volumes, encryption, distributed storage, rapid software change, privacy requirements, tool limitations, and uncertainty in attributing activities to individuals. Future research should prioritise standardised tool evaluation, automated evidence correlation, cloud forensic readiness, privacy-preserving methods, and auditable AI-assisted analysis. Ultimately, effective digital forensics requires a combination of scientific rigour, technical expertise, legal compliance, and responsible professional judgement. Continued collaboration between researchers, practitioners, technology providers, and standards organisations will be important for improving investigative reliability as digital systems continue to evolve.

References:-

1. Lyle, J. R., Guttman, B., Butler, J., Sauerwein, K., Reed, C., & Lloyd, C. (2022). Digital Investigation Techniques: A NIST Scientific Foundation Review. National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 8354. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8354>
2. Herman, M., Iorga, M., Salim, A. M., Jackson, R. H., Hurst, M. R., Leo, R., Lee, R., Landreville, N., Mishra, A. K., Wang, Y., & Sardinas, R. (2020). NIST Cloud Computing Forensic Science Challenges. National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 8006. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8006>
3. Casino, F., Dasaklis, T. K., Spathoulas, G., Anagnostopoulos, M., Ghosal, A., Borocz, I., Solanas, A., Conti, M., & Patsakis, C. (2022). Research trends, challenges, and emerging topics of digital forensics: A review of reviews. *IEEE Access*, 10, 25464–25493. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3154059>
4. Lillis, D., Becker, B., O'Sullivan, T., & Scanlon, M. (2016). Current challenges and future research areas for digital forensic investigation. *Proceedings of the 11th ADFSL Conference on Digital Forensics, Security and Law*.
5. Breiting, F., Hilgert, J.-N., Hargreaves, C., Sheppard, J., Overdorf, R., & Scanlon, M. (2024). DFRWS EU 10-year review and future directions in digital forensic research. *Forensic Science International: Digital Investigation*, 48, Article 301685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsidi.2023.301685>
6. Hargreaves, C., Breiting, F., Dowthwaite, L., Webb, H., & Scanlon, M. (2024). DFPulse: The 2024 digital forensic practitioner survey. *Forensic Science International: Digital Investigation*, 51.
7. Garfinkel, S. L. (2010). Digital forensics research: The next 10 years. *Digital Investigation*, 7, S64–S73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diin.2010.05.009>
8. National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2024). NIST Cloud Computing Forensic Reference Architecture. NIST Special Publication 800-201. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-201>
9. Beebe, N. L. (2009). Digital forensic research: The good, the bad and the unaddressed. In *Advances in Digital Forensics V*. Springer.
10. Reith, M., Carr, C., & Gunsch, G. (2002). An examination of digital forensic models. *International Journal of Digital Evidence*, 1(3).