

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3442
Title of the Manuscript:	A Machine Learning Method for Spam Detection in Twitter using Naive Bayes and ERF Algorithms
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Importance of manuscript: The paper has a relevant topic in today's life. The author has explained a very clear research objective along with NB and ERF algorithm. The methodology mentioned for the evaluation metrics is accountable and proven.</p> <p>Dislike: Very few grammatical and structural issues of the English sentence. Lack of details on the ERF Algorithm. Missing the understanding of Data set and experimental setup</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested title but not recommended.: "Comparative study of Naive Bayes and Enhanced Random Forest for Spam Detection in Twitter"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>What to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear problem statement - Details on the datasets used - mention of evaluation criteria - summary of key results <p>What to remove:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grammar and clarity issue - Ambiguous terms like "Gobbled" and "Hackers to spam" 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Suggestion for subsection refinement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly define the ERF algorithm - Explicit result comparison for both the algorithm NB and ERF side-by-side 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Manuscript is robust:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - well defined the problem on "spam detection on Twitter" - well established recognized algorithm NB & ERF - appropriate evaluation metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall and F1 score - Datasets used for spam detection. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>Latest paper from last 5 years might have been cited, 2019 onwards.</p> <p>All the papers are from 2018 or before.</p> <p>Try to refer some good paper from top conference (e.g., NeurIPS, ICML, ACL , WWW) ad reputed journal from Machine Learning research, IEEE Trans on Neural Networks.</p>	

[Review Form 2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Few grammatical error may be replaced:</p> <p><i>"The main social media is Instagram, Facebook and twitter."</i> → Change to: "The main social media platforms are Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter."</p> <p><i>"These online social media users makes the information independently and also they can gobble the information."</i> → Change to: "Users of these platforms create and consume information independently."</p> <p><i>"There are so many domains accepts the vital role of analyzing the social media."</i> → Change to: "Many domains recognize the vital role of analyzing social media data."</p> <p><i>"Gobbled the information"</i> → <i>"Consume information"</i> <i>"Hackers to spam"</i> → <i>"Cybercriminals use spamming techniques"</i></p> <p>Replace <i>"These are the media which are connecting the global"</i> with <i>"These platforms connect users worldwide."</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments are mentioned above.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ajay Kumar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>China</p>