

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3442
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Machine Learning Method for Spam Detection in Twitter using Naive Bayes and ERF Algorithms</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book Chapter</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the growing issue of spam detection on Twitter, a prevalent problem in online social networks. By utilizing Naive Bayes and Enhanced Random Forest algorithms, the study offers a robust framework for accurately classifying spam and non-spam tweets, which is crucial for improving user experience and security on social media platforms. The detailed methodology, including data preprocessing and feature extraction, provides a comprehensive approach that can be replicated and built upon by other researchers. I appreciate the manuscript's thoroughness in comparing different machine learning models and its focus on optimizing performance metrics, making it a valuable contribution to the field of cybersecurity and machine learning.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract of the article provides a general overview of the problem of spam in social media, particularly on Twitter, and mentions the use of Naive Bayes and Enhanced Random Forest classifiers for spam detection. However, it could be improved for comprehensiveness and clarity. Here are some suggestions: 1) Clarify Objectives and Methods: The abstract should clearly state the main objectives of the study and the specific methods used. For example, it should mention the key steps in the methodology, such as data collection, preprocessing, feature extraction, and classification. 2) Highlight Key Results: Include a brief summary of the key findings, such as the performance metrics (accuracy, precision, F1 score) achieved by the proposed methods. 3) Mention the Significance: Explain the significance of the study and its potential impact on the field of spam detection and social media security. 4) Improve Language and Structure: The abstract should be written in clear and concise language, avoiding any grammatical errors or awkward phrasing.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	1) In the current form abstract is not systematic. It is suggested to arrange it in the following order: Background, methods used, results achieved and concluding remarks. 2) In my opinion introduction should contain the detailed background, then include the challenges of the previous literatures, motivation of the work, objectives of the papers, contributions, and paper organization. In the current form it is missing. The background and challenges should be supported by proper citations. In the current form it is vague.	
<b>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.</b>	1) Provide more details about the datasets used for training and testing. Mention the size of the dataset, the diversity of the data (e.g., different types of Spams), and any specific challenges related to the dataset. 2) clearly articulate what makes this approach unique compared to previous models in the literature. 3) Kindly mention the specific algorithm used in Algorithm implementation section(NB is an existing approach) 4) In the results and discussion section, mention the accurate results(not to mention as around 45%) 5) Include the limitations of the current work. 6) Provide an analysis of where the proposed model may have failed or underperformed	

[Review Form 2](#)

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Comparison should be performed with the latest Journal papers from 2023 and 2024.	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b>  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Rigorous English revision is needed in the complete paper.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Swetha Chikkasabbenahalli Venkatesh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Computational Sciences &amp; IT, Garden City University, India</b>