

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_114935
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Resilience: Smart Grid Cybersecurity and Fault Diagnosis Strategies
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>First suggestion: give some metrics of the software and hardware and development efforts.</p> <p><i>The reader is expecting (numerical) figures and facts, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * size of the team[s] developing the software. (is it two persons, or a thousand developers); duration (month, years, decade) of the development effort. * programming language[s] used by the software and source code size. (is it C, C++, Ada or assembler code. has it a thousand lines of source code, or more than 20 millions lines). <p>The reader is expecting something like "a million embedded devices with a ARM7 processor and 512Mbytes of RAM and 16Mbytes of ROM each have been deployed"</p> <p>Second suggestion: say something about the developer tools and methodologies used to mitigate or lower the cybersecurity risks.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Mention obviously the programming languages used, and the operating system used by developers and running (if any) on the fog / cloud / enduser device</p> <p>state in written English some of the in house coding rules, or coding methodologies</p> <p>Third suggestion: give actual metrics and figures of the Cybersecurity and Fault Diagnosis Strategies</p> <p>this should include things like: <i>we got 100 cyberattacks in march 2022, and 5 of them have been able to shutdown the electricity in a hospital, a restaurant, a metro.... but 95 cyberattacks have been without harm.</i></p> <p>Fourth suggestion: relate to past R&D projects and consortia</p> <p>Fifth suggestion: mention coding rules and standards</p> <p>Third suggestion: give actual metrics and figures about the protocols and the messages exchanged between ending devices, fog, cloud</p> <p>Is it TCP/IP, MQTT, JSONRPC?</p> <p>What is the amount of kilobytes (or gigabytes, or petabytes??) exchanged every day between the digital meter devices and the datacenters?</p> <p>How do you deal with transmission failures or errors?</p> <p>What is the impact or external events (e.g. thunderstorm, burning transformers) and how are these detected?</p> <p>Fourth suggestion: explain the machine learning algorithms suggested in figure 2</p> <p>do you use SVM? PAC learning? AdaBoost? artificial neural networks (how many neurons, how many layers)?</p> <p>what measurable improvements (to client satisfaction, or power grid stability and availability, or decrease of costs) did these algorithms provided?</p> <p>what where the unsuccessful or almost useless algorithms that you tried and abandoned?</p> <p>Fifth suggestion: did you use any "expert system" approach, like e.g. CLIPSrules.net (https://www.clipsrules.net/ or https://www.swi-prolog.org/man/clpfd.html ...)? If yes why, if not why not? If some rules have been formalized to a computer, please give them as you have input them in a file, and explain them in the text. Whatr was the inference engine? How did you deal with metaknowledge? what is the knowledge representation?</p>	
--	--	--

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Basile Starynkevitch
Department, University & Country	France