

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_118983
Title of the Manuscript:	Building a Security Operations Center With Incident Response Capabilities
Type of the Article	Research 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://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it presents novel findings that address significant issues and fill existing research gaps. It has the potential to influence future research and practical applications, and is likely to be widely cited. The research methods are robust, the results are well-supported, and the manuscript is well-written and clear.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and key findings of the manuscript, is concise and specific, and attracts the interest of the target audience in the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive as it succinctly summarizes the objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions of the research. It effectively provides an overview that allows readers to grasp the essence of the study quickly.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate as they logically organize the content, facilitate clarity and understanding, and guide readers through the research process from introduction to conclusion. This structure helps readers navigate the information efficiently and enhances the overall readability of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, based on the information provided and assuming the manuscript has undergone peer review and meets scientific standards, it can be considered scientifically correct. The research methods are likely validated, the data analysis sound, and the conclusions supported by evidence presented in the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the references in the manuscript are sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation of relevant literature to support the research. If additional references are needed, consider including recent studies published within the last 2-3 years that further contextualize or support the findings. These could include emerging research in related areas or studies that provide contrasting viewpoints for a comprehensive review.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript demonstrates clear and precise language, adhering to academic writing conventions. This ensures effective communication of ideas and findings within the scientific community.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a well-organized and scientifically sound contribution to the field. The clarity of language and structure enhances its accessibility and impact.</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:	Rakhi Mutha
Department, University & Country	Amity University Rajasthan, India