



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_66791
Title of the Manuscript:	A Detailed Analysis of Benchmark and Recent Datasets for Network Intrusion Detection System
Type of the Article	Review 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Can mention related work, state of the art, more clear like highlighted one statement, for gaps, something issues, And add one paragraph about your work will present ... 2- Add more details to clear for recommendation and highlight of which dataset better and explain why and if there some barriers or gab, highlighted that for readers of the paper that main objective of your work. 3- Should add more details for the table like comparisons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Separate train-test set (which Methods can be using K-fold or SMOTH,) - which can be using unlabeled like an unsupervised or labeled supervisor - which one potential to use for Anomaly, Signature, Hybrid - which when can be got more Performance, Accuracy and False Positive Rate FPR, and can say more reliability. 4- Explain more this considering for contribution, in the last section. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Some place check formatting, Proofreading	
Optional/General comments	Structure of paragraph, especially when talking of each Dataset sections, highlighted for features, and gaps or disadvantages, as direct statements.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Belal Sudqi Abed Saleh Khater</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Malaya (UM), Malaysia</i>