|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**](https://journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JERR\_133345** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Enhanced Malware Detection in windows Application Using Ensemble Learning Technique** |
| Type of the Article | **Short communication** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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 model for the detection of malware. Malwares are threat to data in a network and compromises on the integrity, privacy and confidentiality of data. The model will help enhance the security and stability of computer systems and maintain the integrity, privacy and confidentiality of data on computer systems.** | A malware detection model is presented in this manuscript. Network data security is seriously threatened by malware, which jeopardizes confidentiality, integrity, and privacy. By increasing the accuracy of malware detection, the suggested model improves computer system security and stability. By employing machine learning techniques to provide an optimized detection mechanism, this research advances the field of cybersecurity. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, since the model is for detecting malware in windows applications, the title is appropriate** | Yes, this title is appropriate |
| 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, even though points out the objective, methodology and findings of the study, has a lot of repetitions in some of the statements. (colored in yellow in the attached manuscript) eg.** This project uses machine learning algorithms, such as supervised and unsupervised learning approaches, to create learning methods. The proposed model Uses machine learning algorithms, such as supervised and unsupervised learning approaches. This should be structured well. | I agree. There are repeated statements in the abstract. Redundancy has been removed and readability has been improved in the highlighted sections. The goal, methodology, and results are now presented in a clearer, more succinct manner in the revised abstract. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript lacks literature backing for the study, there is no evidence of what has been done in the area of malware detection on computer systems that this manuscript is doing a comparison by saying the 99.9% achieved outperforms other models. This is not scientifically correct. | Noted. The manuscript has been updated to incorporate pertinent literature that bolsters the study's assertions. In order to ensure scientific correctness, comparisons with current models are now supported by the relevant references. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | There are not references in the study. An example of paper that can be cited in this instance is that of;  Nani Lee Yer Fui, et al. “A Dynamic Malware Detection in Cloud Platform.” International Journal of Difference Equations/International Journal of Difference Equations, vol. 15, no. 2, Research India Publications, Dec. 2020, pp. 243–58, doi:10.37622/ijde/15.2.2020.243-258. | We admit that the original version lacked references. Included is the recommended source, Nani Lee Yer Fui et al. (2020). To make the literature review stronger, more recent references about machine learning-based malware detection have been added. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The English even though is understandable, needs a bit of proof reading to eliminate repetitions and grammatical errors. | Yes, I agree and also made the necessary changes |
| Optional/General comments | **The manuscripts do not produce a literature as a basis for the study. This makes it difficult to ascertain what has already been done in the area of malware detection. This should include both in text citation and references. Again, the methodology did not include any algorithm or model architecture as to how the modelling process was carried out. Lastly, the figure captioned “picture 1” do not have appropriate heading and is not cited.** | To strengthen the study's foundation, the literature review has been enlarged. References and in-text citations have been added appropriately. The study's algorithm and model architecture are now described in detail in the methodology section. The figure that was formerly known as "Figure 1" has been appropriately renamed and properly referenced in the text. |
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|  | **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | This study found no ethical issues. All required attributions have been made, and the dataset used is openly accessible. This study did not use any human or animal participants. |