



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_42730
Title of the Manuscript:	A Machine Learning Algorithm Based on Inverse Problems for Cyber Anomaly Detection
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	In this paper, a Inverse Machine Learning Algorithm (IMLA) has been proposed for cyber anomaly detection. The proposed method has been evaluated on publicly available dataset and can provide promising results compared with several supervised learning methods. The techniques used in this manuscript is reasonable and the implementation of the proposed method has been presented in details. In reviewer's option, the current maunscript can be improved in the following aspects: (1) The references should be updated, since the most recent reference has been published in 2015. (2) The paragraphs from line 48 to line 57 "We have used Python ..." and from line 127 to 133 "We have implemented the IMLA ..." should be moved to Section 4 Results and Discussion. (3) The presentation of this manuscript should be improved.	Thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript. Below I summarize my responses to the comments. I believe that all of the comments have been addressed in a way that you would find satisfactory. I thank you very much for their detailed and thoughtful critiques. The manuscript has been greatly improved as a result of your effort. Our point-by-point responses to your comments are detailed here. Responses highlighted in yellow in the manuscript as well. 1. As I revised the paper, I had to revise the references sections as well. Following recent references added to the introduction section of the manuscript to remove the gap of research. Four recently published papers in the field are added to the references as follows: [16] Tahmassebi, A., Gandomi, A. H., McCann, I., Schulte, M. H., Schmaal, L., Goudriaan, A. E., & Meyer-Baese, A. (2017, June). An evolutionary approach for fMRI big data classification. In <i>Evolutionary Computation (CEC), 2017 IEEE Congress on</i> (pp. 1029-1036). IEEE. [17] Tahmassebi, A., Gandomi, A. H., Schulte, M. H., Goudriaan, A. E., Foo, S. Y., & Meyer-Baese, A. (2018). Optimized Naive-Bayes and Decision Tree Approaches for fMRI Smoking Cessation Classification. <i>Complexity</i>, 2018. [18] Tahmassebi, A. (2018, May). ideep: Deep learning in a flash. In <i>Disruptive Technologies in Information Sciences</i> (Vol. 10652, p. 106520S). International Society for Optics and Photonics. [19] Tahmassebi, A., & Gandomi, A. H. (2018). Building energy consumption forecast using multi-objective genetic programming. <i>Measurement</i>, 118, 164-



SDI Review Form 1.6

		171. 2. We have moved the code and highlighted to the new section. 3.The presentation of the manuscript is improved in multiple ways: i. Paper has been proofread multiple times and the necessary changes have been made. ii. All reviewer's comments are incorporated to the manuscript. All section including "Abstract" and "Concluding Remarks" has been modified. iii. The resolution of the figures has been improved by including the original figures. Definitely, the pdf conversion was creating the distortions. Thank you for your valuable critiques.
Optional/General comments		