

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_112469</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Ransomware Epidemic: Recent Cybersecurity Incidents Demystified</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Topic is interesting but the study scope still insufficient for a review article and systematic literature survey</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not Sufficient</p> <p>Need To Revise Precisely and Concisely</p> <p>Major revision and correction are compulsory</p> <p>More than 35 well refereed and recently published papers are required to include in the survey. Papers must be collected and selected as high quality publications from well known publishers and platforms like IEEE Access, Elsevier, Nature, Springer, MDPI. Review articles as well as research articles, journal articles and conference papers will be useful.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Authors did not highlight the systematic methodology to review literature and related studies in terms of workflow diagram, methodology steps or flowchart, search scope, scholar searching libraries and publishers.</li> <li>2- Authors need to critically appraise the outcomes of the surveyed literature and compare among them in terms of their utilized datasets, features, feature level fusion, dataset sources and sizes, types of machine learners, design of classifiers (single, ensemble, hybrid), performance evaluation (TPR, TNR, FPR, FNR or Precision, recall, F1-Score) in the context of sections (2 and 4). Furthermore, a Table of comparative analysis is a MUST to include in section 4.</li> <li>3- Taxonomy of ransomware detection or classification approaches is needed in section 2.</li> <li>4- Antonymy of ransomware types (locker and crypto) with their families, and versions, is required in section 2.</li> <li>5- Table or Antonymy of publicly used datasets in the related works or surveyed literature is needed to extend section 2 (into 2.3 datasets and databases of ransomware samples).</li> <li>6- Critical discussion of existing shortcomings and overlooks is required to address in the section of 5 as either a table with referenced studies or a context.</li> <li>7- Accordingly, both abstract and conclusions must be re-written to demonstrate the highlights of review and evaluation precisely. Problems of review articles related to subject, issues need to boost up in terms of classifiers, used datasets, and features.</li> <li>8- No clear article aims and objectives in abstract. Authors have to revise them and include them.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hiba Zuhair</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Information Engineering, Al-Nahrain University, Iraq</b>