

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_130365
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Incident Response Strategies in U.S. Healthcare Cybersecurity
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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>
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 addresses critical gaps in cybersecurity incident response strategies within the U.S. healthcare sector, an area of growing importance given the increasing frequency and impact of cyberattacks. Its focus on leveraging AI-driven technologies and quantitative analyses provides actionable insights for improving detection and containment times, which are vital for safeguarding sensitive patient data. By highlighting the operational and financial ramifications of breaches, the study offers valuable guidance for healthcare organizations to enhance resilience and security. The proposed framework aligns with evolving regulatory standards and advanced technological practices, making it a significant contribution to the scientific and healthcare communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus on enhancing incident response strategies in healthcare cybersecurity. However, a more concise alternative could be: "Enhancing Cybersecurity Incident Response in U.S. Healthcare: A Quantitative and AI-Driven Approach."	
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, effectively summarizing the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. However, it could be further refined by briefly mentioning the statistical significance of findings related to AI-driven systems and their comparative advantage over traditional methods. This would strengthen the abstract's appeal to readers focused on quantitative impacts.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust, employing rigorous quantitative methods, such as linear regression and clustering analysis, supported by credible data sources like the HHS Breach Portal and MITRE ATT&CK Framework. The conclusions drawn align well with the presented evidence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, diverse, and include recent studies up to 2024. To further enrich the manuscript, incorporating more examples of real-world applications of AI in healthcare cybersecurity (e.g., recent case studies or implementations) would add practical depth.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and professional, meeting the standards of scholarly communication. Some sentences could benefit from slight rephrasing to improve readability and flow, particularly in technical sections.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript effectively addresses a critical challenge in the healthcare sector by exploring advanced incident response strategies for cybersecurity. Its quantitative approach and focus on AI-driven solutions provide practical insights and actionable recommendations for improving detection, containment, and overall resilience. However, further discussion on the feasibility of implementing the proposed solutions, especially for smaller healthcare organizations with limited resources, could enhance the paper's impact. Additionally, elaborating on specific case studies or successful deployments of AI in healthcare cybersecurity would strengthen the manuscript's real-world applicability. Overall, this is a well-structured and timely contribution to the field that will benefit both academic researchers and industry practitioners.	

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:	Ankush Ramprakash Gautam
Department, University & Country	United States of America