



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_46653</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Historical Perspective of Botnet Tools</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Paper</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Section Introduction should include how the paper is organized (sections and sub-sections). It would help to understand the structure of the paper from the beginning.</li><li>2. One of the critical aspects of the paper is that there not solutions or possible ways of minimizing the risks associated to the botnets. I would suggest to include a section including it.</li><li>3. Please, clarify if the only figure included is original or not. It has a reference. Does it mean that it is not original?</li><li>4. The paper includes a list of botnets organized by year, not really the life cycle of the botnets. Please, review the term. The life cycle of the botnets should include a deep analysis of the evolution of the botnets, (objectives, analysis, design, implementation...). The phases are not described at all.</li><li>5. Is there not a risk evaluation related to this study or even an analysis of the impacts related to the botnets? Only a list of samples, but not the real impact Please, could you clarify it? It is a critical aspect of the paper.</li><li>6. There is no description about the mitigations applied to all these samples included into the table 1.</li><li>7. Another critical aspect of the paper is related to the Table 1. This table is too generic. There is no a description or a simple analysis about the concepts included into the table.</li><li>8. About the are the references. The most recent reference of the table 1 is from 2013. Since 2013 the botnets are more sophisticated and it has a lot of relationships with other areas of threats. The references and the analysis performed need to be improved on this area.</li><li>9. The conclusions of the paper should be clarified:</li></ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Botnet is not just a threat but a group of threats acting as an entity. The goal of the botnet is to make the activities network users uncoordinated and uncontrollable.</i> The goals of the botnets have not been analysed at all. It is related to the comment of the life cycle.</li> <li>• The sentence: <i>crime and it possible solution are directly proportional.</i> This sentence is not clear.</li> <li>• <i>A collaborative effort in cubing this trend with a hybrid mechanism such as EDM proposed by [11] as well as other mechanisms proposed thus far should be encouraged.</i> It is related to the comment 2. The solutions / mechanisms / processes to mitigate the risks need to be analysed into the paper.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>10. Try to increase the number of references, including references about the solutions.</p> <p>11. It would be useful to have a table with the different type of botnets and the processes to mitigate the risks.</p> <p>12. Is this study finished? Are there no future works related?</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>13. In general terms, the paper is interesting. An improvement is necessary, including aspects about the references, the solutions or the clarification about the life cycle.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jose Ramón Coz Fernández</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Complutense of Madrid, Spain</b>