

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_101578
Title of the Manuscript:	Cyber Threat Intelligence; Current Trends And Future Perspectives
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript entitled "Cyber Threat Intelligence; Current Trends And Future Perspectives" has been reviewed successfully. I appreciate the author's works, but it requires substantial modification. The formatting of paper is not appropriate as well as heading and subheading are not labelled properly.</p> <p>2. No i. "And" should be written as "and" ii. Replace " ;," with " :"</p> <p>"Cyber Threat Intelligence: Current Trends and Future Perspectives"</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. Needs some modification.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. There are some grammatical errors in abstract and other sections as well. The heading "Conclusions" should be written as "Conclusion". Repetition of sentences is also available which is not a good practice.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Javed Alam
Department, University & Country	United Arab Emirates