

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_120693
Title of the Manuscript:	Developing a Comprehensive Ransomware and Bot-Net Defense Strategy for Remote Workforces Utilizing VPN Networks
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights and recommendations for the scientific community regarding endpoint security strategies for remote workforces utilizing VPN networks. However, there are some areas for improvement in the manuscript. The language and English quality could be refined to better suit scholarly communications, with more concise and precise technical terminology, clearer transitions between topics, and correct grammar, punctuation, and formatting. Additionally, the methodology and results sections could be condensed for better clarity and concision. Overall, the manuscript presents important research on a timely topic, and with some revisions, it can make a significant contribution to the scientific</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A bit lengthy: The title is a bit long and could be shortened to make it more concise and attention-grabbing. 2. Lack of creativity: The title is fairly straightforward and doesn't particularly stand out or spark curiosity. <p>Suggestion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shorten the title: Consider shortening the title to something like "Ransomware and Bot-Net Defense for Remote Workforces: A Comprehensive Strategy" to make it more concise and easier to read. 2. Add a hook: Consider adding a hook or a twist to the title to make it more interesting and attention-grabbing. For example, "Beyond VPNs: A Novel Approach to Ransomware and Bot-Net Defense for Remote Workforces". 	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add more specific details: Consider adding more specific information about the research methods, technologies, and measures used in the study to provide a clearer understanding of the research. 2. Provide quantitative results: Including some quantitative results or metrics, such as the percentage of attack reduction or the improvement in network performance, could strengthen the abstract and provide more concrete evidence of the research's impact. 3. Use more precise language: Avoid using overly broad terms and instead opt for more precise language to describe the research findings and recommendations. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>By consolidating the subsections and focusing on the main themes, the manuscript will be easier to follow and understand. Additionally, consider using headings and subheadings consistently throughout the manuscript to maintain a clear and organized structure.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents a scientifically robust and technically sound study on endpoint security strategies for remote workforces utilizing VPN networks, focusing on mitigating ransomware and botnet attacks. The research employs a mixed-methods approach, which combines quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive analysis. The use of data from reputable sources, such as the AV-TEST Institute, and the application of statistical methods, such as regression analysis and ANOVA, strengthen the credibility of the findings. The simulation of network segmentation strategies using NS3 and the development of an incident response plan guided by the MITRE ATT&CK framework further demonstrate the scientific rigor of the study. The integration of user education and cybersecurity awareness assessment, supported by ENISA reports and surveys, adds to the study's validity and practical relevance. Overall, the manuscript's adherence to scientific</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>I think they are sufficient and recent</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally good, but there are some areas that could be improved to make it more suitable for scholarly communications. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sentence structure and length: Some sentences are quite long and convoluted, making them difficult to follow. Breaking them up into shorter, simpler sentences would improve clarity. 2. Technical terminology: While the article uses technical terms correctly, some explanations could be more concise and precise. For example, the definition of "endpoint security" could be more detailed. 3. Transitions and connections: The article jumps between different topics, such as endpoint security, network segmentation, incident response, and user education. Using transitional phrases and sentences could help connect these topics more smoothly. 4. Grammar and punctuation: There are some minor errors in grammar, punctuation, and formatting (e.g., inconsistent use of commas, missing articles, and incorrect spacing). 5. Clarity and concision: Some sections, such as the methodology and results, could be condensed to make them more concise and easier to follow. 6. **Use of active and passive voice 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents an interesting and relevant topic in the context of the increasing shift towards remote work and the growing threats of ransomware and botnet attacks. The mixed-methods approach provides a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and potential solutions for securing remote workforces utilizing VPN networks. The study's findings highlight the importance of a multi-layered approach, incorporating advanced technologies, proactive measures, and continuous user education, which can significantly strengthen the endpoint security posture of organizations.</p> <p>However, there are some areas for improvement in the manuscript. The language and English quality could be refined to better suit scholarly communications, with more concise and precise technical terminology, clearer transitions between topics, and correct grammar, punctuation, and formatting. The methodology and results sections could be condensed for better clarity and concision, and the figures and tables could be improved for better readability and accessibility. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the limitations and implications of the study, as well as suggestions for future research. Overall, the manuscript presents valuable research on a timely topic, and with some revisions, it can make a significant contribution to the scientific community.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asmaa Salih Hammoodi
Department, University & Country	Tikrit University, Iraq