

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. It is important for computer security research community.</p> <p>2. Suggested Title as "Cyber Threat Intelligence: Current Trends and Future Perspective"</p> <p>3. The abstract is acceptable.</p> <p>4. The sub-sections need to have major improvement and the discussion is vague.</p> <p>5. Scientifically OK, however the discussion is not comprehensive and well structured.</p> <p>6. References is sufficient.</p> <p>7. The figures are not referred in the paragraph.</p> <p>8. There are lots of spelling mistake</p> <p>9. Some of the figure is not related to explanation within the sub-sections.</p> <p>10. Some of the sub-section title are not align with the content</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Many spelling mistake</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In overall, the topic is interesting. However, the content is lack of comprehensive discussion due to the arrangement of the sub-section are not well organize. Need major improvement.</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:	Robiah Binti Yusof
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknikal Malaysia, Malaysia