



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	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.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	– multiple errors of grammar and syntax – multiple typographical errors	
---	---	--

Note: Anonymous Reviewer