



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11874
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Assessment of Computer Security Incidence Handling
Type of the Article	Review 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	The author presents an interesting review analysing some papers, but in my opinion there is a lack of a methodology for the review. Without a methodology it is very difficult to know if the review is exhaustive or not. What are the real focus cases? What are the discarded papers? Why? In my opinion, it is mandatory to create a section explaining In detail what are the reasons for the selection of papers for the review.	Appropriate review methodology has been described, with focus on the approach, details covering the period under review and the reasons. See lines 39-48.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	In general I consider the paper interesting and well presented	