SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	The topic is relevant and the authors present a paper on a well-studied and important topic about security in educational enterprise environment. The manuscript gives nice presentation of the existing literature mentioning some of the important security challenges. The main drawback of this manuscript is lack of novelty. Differences between currently available frameworks and solutions and the proposed one are not clearly stated. Authors should provide better explanation about the innovations brought by the paper. Text in section 2 is mostly taken from the article Different Type Network Security Threats and Solutions, A Review (IPASJ International Journal of Computer Science (IIJCS), 2017), so this reference must be added. References are needed for section 2.2 and 2.2.1. The survey method mentioned in section 3 must be better explained (was it questionnaire, type of questions, survey analysis – what network security problems are identified etc.). Also, reasons for network design presented in section 3.1 must be added and explanation of design as well. Security mechanisms in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 are well-known and part of every security policy, so it is unclear what enhancements are made. In 3.3 a firewall is mentioned, so it would be good to explain what security policies are you suggesting in order to protect your network and resources (keeping in mind that it is educational institution). Section 4 (results) must be seriously improved and expanded since currently it mentions only two show commands. Title for 4.1 mentions *show ip route* command and there is a result for *show port-security interface* command in text. Also, I suggest using English language for the result of this command. Conclusion should be expanded with suggestions for future work. References must be improved (unified style and formatting should be used). Although English was generally good, some typing errors must be corrected. Paper formatting must be improved (eg. Numbering for Exploit attack in 2.2 is not same as for the other attacks). Also there are some style issues (eg. In 2.2.1 sometimes "you" is used and sometimes "they" is used – it should be unified).	
Minor REVISION comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Jelena Šuh***
Department, University & Country	***Serbia***