Thank you for your submission and the extensive efforts evident in your work. The topic is very relevant and the experiments and findings are encouraging. However, in order to further improve the quality and clarity of the manuscript, I have the following constructive suggestions:

1. Figures 1-9 are not clear and blurry. Please replace them with higher resolution figures.
2. Use the abbreviations table.
3. Figure 3 is difficult to read due to its vertical layout. It is recommended that you redraw it in horizontal format for better readability. You can also delete the current version entirely and consider a newly designed diagram.
4. On line 368, the phrase "Harris Hawkes Optimization (hho)" should be written in uniform capital letters: "Harris Hawkes Optimization (HHO)".
5. You can review and cite the following related articles to strengthen your literature background and methodological position. . These articles are relevant to your work:https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7080/12/10/197,https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/18/1/190, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00202-025-03036-4.
6. The ""Proposed Method Solution" is long, repetitive, and sometimes lacks structural clarity. Consider dividing it into subsections such as:

Dataset preparation, model architecture, optimization process, and evaluation strategy.

Equations (1) and (2) describing the HHO algorithm are not clearly typed and lack parameter definitions. Please correct them for clarity and proper formatting.

7. Some parts of the text are repetitive or written informally, i.e., phrases such as "as shown in", "this shows, "which our cyber-attack detection framework or "We discovered additional shortcomings" should be rewritten in a more formal academic style. The manuscript should follow the dominant tone and structure of the paper.
8. The research contribution is somewhat incomplete. It is useful to explicitly highlight the novelty of the work, especially the advantages of using Harris Hawkes Optimization (HHO) compared to previous optimization methods. Provide a dedicated "Contributions" subsection clearly.
9. It is mentioned that CnnSVM is implemented in TensorFlow/Keras, no information is provided about the environment or tools for XGBoost or the HHO algorithm. Please mention these (like Python, Scikit-learn, MATLAB, etc.).
10. Although the tables, benchmarks, and experimental results are informative, the explanations provided for them are scattered. It is suggested that the flow and organization of the text be improved so that the reader can better understand and follow the results.