

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_118126
Title of the Manuscript:	Combating The Challenges of False Positives in AI-Driven Anomaly Detection Systems and Enhancing Data Security in the Cloud
Type of the Article	Journal Manuscript

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>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>Yes, This work incorporates deep learning models, integrates significant security measures, and leverages AI-driven methodologies to increase anomaly detection performance.</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, In this paper, authors proposed deep learning models, integrates significant security measures, and leverages AI-driven methodologies to increase anomaly detection performance. The area of research is in recent and current areas. Section 1 goes into great length about the topic's introduction. Section 2 lacks a literature review; The author looked at a number of recent studies, however they weren't really relevant to our problem description. While Section 3 presented suggested techniques, the substance is general. In section 3, The results analysis is discussed; however it's a bit perplexing and unclear at times. The description requires improvement.</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Overall, the work makes several useful contributions to the research problem under consideration, despite some small flaws. It should be changed to fix the small weaknesses acknowledged above. Minor modification and resubmission is recommended.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>To address language concerns, the few places paper should be proofread in English.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	N.Venkateswaran
Department, University & Country	Jyothishmathi Institute of Technology and Science, India