



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_46653
Title of the Manuscript:	The Historical Perspective of Botnet Tools
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is completely unclear the purpose, the methodology, the results pursued what is the point of an analysis on old data, which stops in 2015, when it is well known that the last 10 years have had other trends in botnets attacks and in their tools? Who then uses this study? what are the actual conclusions, what does the novelty bring in the field? "This paper has brought to the awareness of the general public the historical perspective of botnet and how it began from the early stage to the recent times" – what awareness? everything in this article is well known both in the literature and especially by the specialists in the field the references used are old and many outdated 	<p>Thank you. Well, the abstract speaks for itself on the purpose if read.</p> <p>In Science, no new thing come into existence without reference to old</p> <p>It is an historical perspective of all botnet tools and their prevention mechanism brought together in one document and I don't think I agree to the comments expressed here.</p> <p>I think the meaning of awareness should be revisited for clarity purpose</p> <p>If not all, experts are trained to know everything in their field. I think this opinion should be jettison</p> <p>If the meaning of the paper was examined critically it means it should reflect the old and new reference as captured by the paper.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>No</p>	I don't agree with the reviewer's comments