

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124252
Title of the Manuscript:	Leveraging AI and Machine Learning for the Protection of Critical National Infrastructure
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Ms_AJRCOS_124252 Leveraging AI and Machine Learning for the Protection of Critical National Infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poorly written Paper 2. No flowchart, no methodology, no AI and Machine learning diagram & stratetegy 3. AI generated article 4. The literature review of this paper lacks depth, without critically analyzing the existing literature, and fails to identify research gaps that could be addressed in this study. A more comprehensive and critical review of the literature would strengthen the paper's foundation. 5. The title of the paper suggests that it will present or explore "AI and Machine Learning for the Protection of Critical National Infrastructure". However, the content of the paper does not effectively deliver on this promise. The manuscript lacks a clear discussion or formulation of an innovative development model. Instead, it primarily reviews existing practices and trends without offering new strategies or models for development. For the paper to be more effective, it should either present a well-defined and innovative development model or adjust the title to better reflect the scope of the study. <p>3) Lack of In-Depth Analysis and Explanation of Results: The paper presents several data points and observations. However, the manuscript falls short in providing a deeper analysis or explanation of these results. The paper does not explore the underlying reasons for the observed differences in the recognition of the internationalized curriculum. Without such analysis, the findings remain superficial, and the paper misses an opportunity to provide valuable insights</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>		
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

:		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wai Yie Leong
Department, University & Country	INTI International University, Malaysia