



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_25839
Title of the Manuscript:	A SECURED FINE-GRAINED ACCESS CONTROL POLICY ON WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS
Type of the Article	Review paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. My biggest concern with this manuscript is that the analysis of the stability of the system response and methods can be explained better since the main description may not be very clear for the readers. The organization and presentation of the paper can be improved. 2. I found some minor mistakes such as comma, article, missing and grammar issues. Authors should review before submit the revised version. 3. Graphics resolution is not adequate, like Figure 3.1 or Figure 4.2. 4. Experimental results should show the initial claims of the paper. 5. I recommend reviewing this paper because it has well-known background for your work in wireless sensor networks and jamming attacks: On the Routing Protocol Influence on the Resilience of Wireless Sensor Networks to Jamming Attacks, C. Del-Valle-Soto, C. Mex-Perera, R. Monroy, J. Nolasco-Flores, Sensors Journal, 15(4), 7619-7649, Mar 2015.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. It would help if the authors give a detailed description on these assumptions/models (e.g. Section Results). 2. Table 4.1 can be explained better. 3. Some examples of output traces would be	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	helpful. 4. More description of the parameters in Table 4.1 should have presented at the start of Section 4. It is necessary to know how these parameters were implemented.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Carolina Del Valle Soto</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Computing Department, Universidad Panamericana, campus Guadalajara, Mexico</i>