

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_130175
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimized DenseNet Architecture for Efficient Classification of Encrypted Internet Traffic
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a significant contribution to the field of internet traffic classification, particularly in the context of encrypted traffic. The enhancement of the DenseNet architecture with a compression layer addresses critical issues of redundant neuron pruning, optimizing performance without compromising accuracy. The study's findings are likely to benefit researchers and practitioners focusing on secure and efficient traffic management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "An Enhanced Convolutional Neural Network for Encrypted Internet Traffic Classification," is suitable as it succinctly conveys the focus and scope of the research. If you choose this title, it would be: "Optimized DenseNet Architecture for Efficient Classification of Encrypted Internet Traffic" This title effectively conveys the manuscript's focus on enhancing the DenseNet architecture to improve performance in classifying encrypted internet traffic.	The authors appreciate the feedback and have corrected the title
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. However, it would be helpful to explicitly highlight the dataset used and a brief mention of performance metrics to enhance its informativeness.	The authors appreciate the feedback and have made changes to reflect the reviewer’s comments
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and methodologically sound. The integration of a compression layer in DenseNet and the use of the Upper Confidence Bound Multi-Armed Bandits algorithm are innovative and adequately justified.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include recent studies. However, incorporating a few additional references from 2023-2024 could enhance the manuscript's contemporary relevance.	The authors appreciate the feedback and have made changes to reflect the reviewer’s comments
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical refinements, such as improving sentence flow in some sections (e.g., "the methodology focuses on..., construced , enhamced, catgories "), would enhance readability.	The authors appreciate the feedback and have made changes to reflect the reviewer’s comments
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-organized, but the inclusion of graphical summaries or flowcharts for the methodology could improve accessibility for readers.	

Review Form 3

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>	