



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR’S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to final evaluator’s comments
In my opinion, there is not enough information about the papers selected. In a classical review article, the paper should have information about what are the bibliographic databases that authors used, what are the search words used, what are the papers that are selected and which of those are rejected and why (at least numerically...)... etc. For that, in my opinion the correction do not address my previous comment	The paper has been slightly modified to accommodate reviewer’s comments concerning the inclusion of material sources (bibliographic databases) used by the authors for the research review, the duration covering the review, the papers rejected and why. However, in my opinion, am not sure how appropriate it is to include search keywords in the contents, since those are already contained in the keywords section of the paper. This means that this too has already been covered.