



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper is concisely written and technically correct. However, there are several typing errors should be fixed for publication. For example, line 20, " 70% of all incoming e-mail" should be " 70% of all incoming e-mails". Moreover, a blank space should be inserted after the punctuation marks "," and ".". For example, line 24, line 28, etc. And, in this paper, the author had used simultaneously three confused appellations: "Naïve Bayesian", "Naive Bayesian", and "naïve Bayesian", which should be confirmed.	Updated paper is attached Updated paper is attached Changed to "naive Bayes"
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No	