



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7675
Title of the Manuscript:	An Efficient Three-phase Email Spam Filtering Technique
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	1. The authors proposed a three-phase email spam filtering algorithm, and claimed that its accuracy rate was more increased than that of each individual algorithm. It would be better to demonstrate a comparison with different algorithms or existing filters, such as: the ROSVM algorithm (Relaxed Online SVMs for Spam Filtering, SIGIR07), the online fusion of DMC and logistic regression algorithm (Email Spam Filtering: A Systematic Review, Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval), the online MFL algorithm (Online Active Multi-Field Learning for Efficient Email Spam Filtering, Knowledge and Information Systems), and so on. 2. The reported measures (TP, TN, FP, FN, DR, FPR, and Overall Accuracy) are widely used in the evaluation of Information Retrieval or Text Classification. However, email spam filtering has its online speciality and the above common measures are not special for the evaluation of spam filtering algorithms. The authors should add some special evaluation measurements and methodologies (such as the ROC analysis, TREC 2007 Spam Track Overview, TREC07) to validate the effectiveness of the proposed spam filtering algorithm.	We already use an existing filter to compare our proposed technique with it (The naive Bayes classifier). We use the same criteria in papers [Shih D. , Jhuan H., "A study of mobile SpaSMS filterig," in <i>The XVIII ACME International Conference on pacific RIM management</i>, Canada, July 24-July 26, 2008.] [Obied A. , "Bayesian Spam Filtering" , 2007] [Tarek M., Ahmed M., "SMS Spam Filtering Technique Based on Artificial Immune System", <i>JCSI International Journal of Computer Science Issues</i>, Vol. 9, Issue 2, No 1, March 2012]



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. The authors should specify exactly how to select messages randomly in the experiments, and should explain why they only use partial data from the trec07p corpus. But, I am more concerned about the experimental results on the full trec07p corpus (75,419 email messages). 4. The manuscript needs to be rewritten in better English.	It is selected manually Updated paper is attached
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		