

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_118126</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Combating The Challenges of False Positives in AI-Driven Anomaly Detection Systems and Enhancing Data Security in the Cloud</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Technology, cybersecurity, energy consumption, and trade</b>

### **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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. This research has the potential to enhance the effectiveness of anomaly detection systems, thereby improving security and reliability across various applications.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Sufficient and recent</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The scholarly communication quality of the article is suitable for academic purposes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Statistical Significance:</b> While the abstract mentions that improvements may not be statistically significant without further refinement, providing more specific details on the statistical tests and their outcomes could strengthen the argument.</li> <li>2. <b>Data Sources:</b> Mentioning specific types of real-world data or examples could enhance the understanding of the application context.</li> <li>3. <b>Future Work:</b> A brief mention of potential future research directions or specific areas for further refinement could add value.</li> </ol>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Arul Selvam P</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hindusthan College of Engineering and Technology, India</b>