



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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In the article reviewed, titled " A Machine Learning Algorithm Based on Inverse Problems for Cyber Anomaly Detection" author(s) modeled anomaly detection system, Inverse Machine Learning Algorithm (IMLA), based on an inverse model approach with Riesz kernel and applying software system development concepts at each phase. The noticed research can be assumed as showing the medium level as well as on, the whole proper searching methodology and description of presented solution. The structure of content of the article along with the results presented prove rather satisfactory knowledge and competences of the author(s), as far as the described kind of science is concerned. The language used in hereby presentation may be described as requiring scarce corrections. At this point it ought to be stated that after a thorough analysis of the assessed work, some shortcomings are to be found.	
Minor REVISION comments	I recommend to weak accept the reviewed article, considering the detailed corrections listed below: - the description of content presented in section 3 requires improvement of mathematical methodology for the sake of more diligent presentation of achieved outcomes - the description of content presented requires more thorough description - the scientific aspect as well as the novelty of solutions need to be enhanced and emphasized in a more distinctive manner - novelty of presented conclusions ought to be more distinguish - the presented figures need to be more legible (i.e. the size of a type should larger) - slightly too short and too general conclusions - editorial standards of references should be corrected - editorial level leaves a bit to be desired, punctuation shortcomings are to be noticed (especially in mathematical formulas)	
Optional/General comments	The reviewed article shows rather sufficient substantive level. Presented contents along with experiments results can be described as satisfactorily original. Hence, I recommend to accept the reviewed article, however the consideration of indicated	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tomasz Andrysiak</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Faculty of Telecommunications, Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, University of Technology and Life Sciences in Bydgoszcz, Poland</i>