

## **Response to the Review Report 2**

### **Dhaka University Journal of Applied Science and Engineering (DUJASE)**

#### **Title of the Manuscript: A Review on Hybrid Analysis in Android Malware Detection**

We wish to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments in this review report. Reviewers' comments provided valuable insights to refine its contents and analysis. In this document, we try to address the issues raised as best as possible. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers.

Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments. All page numbers refer to the revised manuscript file with tracked changes.

#### **Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:**

**Point No. 3:** Is the major argument clear? Is the analysis competent and consistent?

#### **Reviewer's Comment:**

- (i) >> Usually a review paper performs rigorous analysis of the existing researches and identify the pros and cons of those works. Moreover, future direction of work should also be suggested. In the discussion part (section VI) the authors try to focus on this issue. However, more detail discussion is required to advance the research in this field. For example, for "Reducing Complexity" it will be better, mentioning the current complexity (with a comparative analysis), give a direction how to reduce that.
- (ii) >> In addition, the authors should provide a detail discussion about the standard dataset and evaluation metrics used in the exiting researches.
- (iii) >> It will be better if the authors explain how hybrid analysis will give better results combining both type of features.

#### **Author response:**

- (i) >> We are grateful for this comment as it points to an important aspect of this study. We agree with the reviewer's assessment. Accordingly, we have included a Future Directions section [Ref: Page 11, Section VII] in addition to the prior Discussion section [Ref: Page 10, Section VI] and thrown in a detailed discussion on the future directions and advancement in this field. For instance, we have given directions to reduce the complexity of hybrid analysis. Yet, we have not comparatively analyzed the current complexity due to the scope of this study and we consider it for our future work.
- (ii) >> Thank you for pointing this out. Although we agree that this is an important consideration, it is beyond the scope of this manuscript because our primary focus

is only on the hybrid analysis's strengths, weaknesses, challenges, opportunities, and future direction.

(iii) >> As suggested by the reviewer, we have explained how hybrid analysis will give better results combining both types of features [Ref: Page 5, Section III].

**Point No. 4:** Are the conclusions sounds and are they applicable to other situations?

**Reviewer's Comment:** As a review paper, more detailed finding should include in the conclusion.

**Author response:** We have refined our conclusion and made it more detailed [Ref: Page 11, Section VIII].

**Point No. 6:** Additional Comments (if necessary)?

**Reviewer's Comment:** Presentation and English writing of the paper should carefully checked.

**Author response:** As suggested by the reviewer, we have reorganized our overall presentation and double-checked the English writing.