

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_122654
Title of the Manuscript:	A SURVEY OF AI METHODS FOR DETECTION OF DDoS ATTACKS ON NETWORKS
Type of the Article	Comprehensive survey or review paper.

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>This manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific community, especially in the field of cybersecurity. It provides an extensive review of the current AI methods used for DDoS attack detection, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each approach. This work is crucial as it helps researchers identify the most effective techniques and potential areas for further research. I appreciate the manuscript's thoroughness and its focus on both machine learning and deep learning techniques, which are vital for advancing cybersecurity measures. However, it could benefit from a more critical analysis of the limitations and challenges in deploying these AI techniques in real-world scenarios.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the article.</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>The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear summary of the key findings of the survey. It effectively highlights the main AI techniques used for DDoS detection and their performance. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning some of the challenges and open issues in this field, which are discussed in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The division into sections like Introduction, Background, AI in DDoS Attack Detection, Related Works, Challenges, and Conclusion provides a logical flow and makes the paper easy to follow.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It provides a well-rounded review of various AI techniques used in DDoS detection, supported by relevant studies and data. The comparison of different AI approaches, including machine learning, deep learning, and bio-inspired algorithms, is detailed and insightful. The manuscript also highlights the evolution of these techniques and their applicability to modern cybersecurity challenges, making it a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners alike.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies. However, it might be beneficial to include some references to the latest works in the field, especially those published after 2021, to ensure that the review is as up-to-date as possible.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and concise language that effectively conveys the technical content.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the practical challenges in implementing AI-based DDoS detection systems, such as computational overhead, integration with existing systems, and the need for real-time processing. Additionally, a brief discussion on the future directions for research in this area would be a valuable addition.</p> <p>Overall, this manuscript provides a valuable contribution to the field of cybersecurity, particularly in the context of DDoS attack detection using AI techniques.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Chng Chern Wei
Department, University & Country	Southern University College, Malaysia