



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>)



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 | <p>With a crucial goal of increasing the level of security by using attack detection techniques such as the Network Intrusion Detection System (NIDS), which monitors and analyzes network flows and the detection of attacks. Present a detailed analysis of the baseline and recent data sets for the NIDS.</p> <p>The main objective of this paper is to offer overviews of the datasets available for the NIDS and what each dataset is made up of. In addition, some recommendations were made for using networked datasets.</p> <p>The problem addressed by this paper is interesting, because of the number of data sets used in many works. Most researchers show the benefit of their solution through a dataset that works for them. While if he uses a different dataset, he is not going to find the same benefits. This makes the results very much dependent on the choice of the dataset.</p> <p>After a presentation of all the recent work that relates to the problem addressed, the author looks at all the data used by the majority of the research work.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>The author considers that the datasets can be used to compare the quality of different NIDS with each other. While the data sets also influence the quality of the models established. Especially the learning-based model. I find that a direct comparison between datasets against a single learning model is mandatory, it allows a good evaluation between datasets and modified models.</p> <p>The discussion needs to be developed. A comparison table between different datasets vis-à-vis the classification of NIDS (anomaly-based detection, anomaly-based detection, hybrid) and mandatory in the discussion.</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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Makhlouf Derdour |
| Department, University & Country | Oum el Boughi university, Algeria |