



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	Re §4.3: The generation of the detectors, a central point of the manuscript, is described only as an idea, but not as an exact algorithm that could be replicated to verify the results of this paper. Re §5: 1. It is not exactly enough described how the spam filters to be tested were trained. Beginning in L.214, it is stated: "This data set consists of 5000 spam and 5000 non spam messages 50 % of them appears in the training set and the other 50 % does not appear before." If this means that 50% of the messages of the test data set are used in the training data set, this would be a highly unrealistic testing scenario: in a real world spam filter, not a single message to be filtered appears before. 2. The results of the experiments given in Table 1 to 6 are incorrect: TN (True Negatives) is the number of non-spam messages that is correctly classified as non-spam, and thus cannot be greater than the total number of non-spam messages, as it is the case in Table 1 to 6. Hence all derived measures are also incorrect and the conclusions are dubious.	yes, we take the idea and implement it in the database by Rejecting the detector (Features) with low affinity (no. of appearance in spam or ham), and Selecting a clone of all detectors that have a highest affinity. There is no message appears before, but the features in this message may be appeared before. Corrected, Updated paper is attached
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	- multiple errors of grammar and syntax - multiple typographical errors	Updated paper is attached