Reviewer 1

1. The abstract is required to be more focused to present the contribution of the work. Make the Abstract more concise be explaining the purpose of study; basic study design, methodology and techniques used; major findings; summary of your interpretations, and implications.

Response 1: Revised as per reviewer's suggestion. Refer to p.1, lines 10-19 for the updated Abstract.

2. The title of the paper is not adequate; An Experiment of Denial of Service Attacking based on CDX 3 platform--------> An Experimental Detection of Distributed Denial of Service Attack in CDX 3 platform based on SNORT.

Response 2: Title revised as suggested. Refer to p.1, lines 2-3 for the updated title.

3. In order to represent the citation in the text use one type of notation, either user Nenova et. al. (2019) or [1].

Response 3: Notation consistency applied as suggested. Refer to p.1-3, lines 23-119, all of Section 1.

4. In line 69, Distributed Denial of Service (DDOS)----> Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS).

Response 4: Corrected as suggested. Refer to p.2, line 51, "... susceptible to DDoS attacks".

5. Add cloud computing in the list of keywords.

Response 5: Cloud Computing added to keywords as suggested. Refer to p.1, line 21, "Cloud Computing".

6. Give proper references for the statistics presented in lines 26-27.

Response 6:

1) References added as suggested. Refer to p.1, lines 27-30, "In September 2017…, in February 2020 [3]".
2) Please also see p.20, Reference [1-3].

7. The flow of paper needs to be improved. Add the proposed approach section to explain your work by taking a system architecture figure and explain it step by step.

Response 7:

1) Section 2 added as suggested. Refer to p.4-5, lines 123-178 for Section 2.
2) For the explanation of the architecture figure, refer to “Figure 2 depicts... address” on p.5-6, lines 189-214, and Figure 2 on p.6.

8. The result section could be stronger. Add more experimental analysis. Moreover, compare your work with existing methods.

Response 8:

1) The results section has been revised as suggested by the reviewer. Refer to p.19, lines 480-502, "In this study... the baseline model."
2) Additional experimental analysis has been included as recommended by the reviewer. Refer to p.17-18, lines 449-460, "We've summarized…abnormal TCP connections."
3) A comparison with existing methods has been included as suggested by the reviewer. Refer to p.18, lines 466-472, "Next, we benchmark …during preprocessing" and p.19, Table 6.

9. To have an unbiased view in the paper, there should be some discussions on the limitations of the proposed work.

Response 9: As suggested by the reviewer, limitations have been discussed on p.19, lines 494-502, "The experiments were … the baseline model."

10. Intro should be revised. Why we need your study (and it is important), and HOW this contributes to prior literature. I would like to see a clear paragraph directed to theoretical contribution in the introduction. Also, represent the research gap clearly.

Response 10: As suggested by the reviewer, the introduction has been revised. Refer to p.3, lines 102-115, "In this paper...achieves superior performance."

11. Add the research methodology section to explain the component of proposed approach. Cite figures in the text and add a proper discussion for them.

Response 11: A research methodology section has been added as per the reviewer's suggestion. Refer to p.4-5, lines 123-178, Section 2.

12. In line 188, author said we use 7 types of DDoS attack generated by Hping3. name the type of DDoS.

Response 12: As suggested by the reviewer, the types of DDoS have been named. Refer to p.6, lines 223-225, "Seven types of DDoS... attack."

13. There is no discussion on the cost effectiveness of the proposed method. What is the computational complexity? What is the runtime? Please include such discussions. You can also use the big oh notation to show the computation complexity.

Response 13: As suggested by the reviewer, these discussions have been included. Refer to p.4, lines 159-169, "The computational complexity... each packet once."

14. The author can read the following papers to improve the quality of the research and discussion on the DDoS detection. methods:10.1109/TSC.2017.2694426, 10.1109/MENACOMM50742.2021.9678279, 10.4018/IJSWIS.297143.

Response 14: As suggested by the reviewer, the recommended papers have been referenced in our research.

1) Refer to p.2, lines 69-73, “A dual-pronged solution is proposed in [11] .... distribution among VMs.”
2) Refer to p.2-3, lines 90-101, “Software Defined Networking... and open challenges.”
3) Refer to p.20, References [11], [16-17].

15. There are some English errors and type errors such as “The second is Intrusion Detection System (IDS), which is Ubuntu-based installed with SNORT------>The second is Intrusion Detection System (IDS), which is Ubuntu-based and installed with SNORT.”

Response 15: As suggested by the reviewer, the English has been revised.

1) Refer to p.5, lines 185-186, “The second component... installed with SNORT.”
2) The paper has been proofread by a native English speaker. Please review the revised document.