

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_80123
Title of the Manuscript:	ENHANCING THE DESIGN OF A SECURED CAMPUS NETWORK USING DEMILITARIZED ZONE AND HONEYPOT AT UEW- KUMASI CAMPUS
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Just the way used to manage by Honey pot and DMZ Paper is not well structured which gives the reader the basis to advance in a critical way and thoroughly through the reading. This research has turned out some interesting findings; I not support publication of this paper and this paper must Compulsory REVISION because this paper lacking new ideas to solve the problem in manage Security Issues in a campus Network. Below are my suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In an abstract, the author(s) should discuss more the performance of result in this research. - In an introduction, the author(s) should discuss more about what problems need to be solved. What are the major problems/main contributions? - In the part of 2.0 Literature Review has some mistake in 3.5 Methods of discovering Vulnerabilities must adjust to 2.4 Methods of discovering Vulnerabilities - in the part of 3. METHODOLOGY the author should show more the detail to use Honey pot and DMZ to solve the problem - Figure 6 Enhanced Campus Network Design is blurred and the author should adjust this figure. - In the Analytical Results and Discussions, the author(s) set tables and graphs to be ok. - The author(s) should present the method for to use Honey pot and DMZ. This can help other readers get more information/gain more ideas about how an experiment was carried out. - The last section (Concluding Remarks) is unsatisfactory yet. In this section I would like to see a detailed and extensive discussion about the findings, about how these findings may be interpreted, about the shortcomings of the studies, and about future research. 	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santi Pattanavichai
Department, University & Country	Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyabur, Thailand