



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_49825
Title of the Manuscript:	Simulation of an Enhanced Network Security Framework for Federal Polytechnic Mubi
Type of the Article	

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) The resolution of the figures is low and not enough for publication. In addition to this, I have seen bunch of distortion that might have happened through the PDF conversion.</p> <p>2) Figure 4 must be provided in English.</p> <p>3) The authors have used some reference that is very old in the field. For example, threat prevention algorithm mentioned in [6]. The following paper can be added to the manuscript to point out the newer methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chen W.H, Hsu S.H, Shen S.H. Application of SVM and ANN for intrusion detection. <i>Computers and Operations Research</i> 32(10), 2617–2634, 2015. A. Sever, A Machine Learning Algorithm Based on Inverse Problems for Cyber Anomaly Detection, <i>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</i>, ISSN: 2457-1024; 2231-0843 ,Vol.: 28, Issue.: 3, 2018. <p>4) The result that is presented in Figure 4 is not clear. The Section 4 should be explained in detail.</p> <p>5) Finally, the authors can have comparative study results and visualize it by using some plots.</p>	<p>The resolution has been increased as observed. Figure 4 has also been looked into and given in English as required.</p> <p>References has been updated to meet current changes.</p> <p>The results of the study have been clearly and explicitly discussed as required</p>
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	