Review Form 2

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_ 3679**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Detection of Jellyfish attack in MANETs using Machine learning**
Type of the Article	**BOOK CHAPTER**

<mark>PART 1:</mark> Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research is important for security enhancement in MANET Features. The methodology of simulator is acceptable in research community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The Title is suitable. The title should be in Title Case.	
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 suitable. It is however short suggesting that some more elements need to be added to it. A suggestion is to include the validity of the results and presentation techniques of such results. A suggestion is to reword the section "This paper presents the …" to "This research presents the …", since the publication is for a book chapter, the word paper is lesser suitable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Section and subsections numberings appear wrong for section 4. We see 4.1 followed by 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3 then we see 4.2. its correction is simple and needed. Else the sectionings appear appropriate.	
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.	The research methodology of simulation is accepted. The results provided by graphical evidence is correct as methodology. It does provide the robustness and technical soundness desired in a research article. Overall, the information presented in the research is sound and well receivable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference are very adequate. The in-text referencing is also appropriate.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments	A few typo mistakes noted: "uselful", "forcast", "recieve"	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Double spaces between words: "where every node is mobile to have dynamic topology. Moreover nodes are even capable of making….". this is repeated many places	
	The program codes appear partially outside the square box provided in the paper for review. This needs addressing.	
Optional/General comments	Figure 3 should be bigger to be more readable.	
	Quite some print space wasted under section 5.4. this can be corrected with adjusting the diagram sizes.	
	The keywords is very poor; many important words are not present in this section like "MANET", "TCP", "ACK" etc. Usually for a book chapter, there is margin for more keywords to be included. Also the format of the acronym followed by its expanded form is preferred like "ML – Machine Learning, TCP – Transmission Control Protocol"	
	The table before section 7 is cumbersome to read and understand since much info is repeated in the different columns. If the author can find better ways of presenting the information, it will be appreciated.	
	Again, as for the abstract, the conclusion is very short (128 words). It shows elements are missing to approach the usual 200 words limit. Also avoid the active voice in research writing ; here you used "In this work we studied the impacts…"	
	The paper has good contents. The writing style needs some improvements. The commentaries provided above is estimated for a consistent 2-day minor reviewing just for the purpose of conforming to usual approved standards in research writing..	

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mohammad Kaleem Galamali**
Department, University & Country	**Université Des Mascareignes, Republic of Mauritius**