

FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article :	Book Chapter

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author can remove the subsection of the introduction. They should also remove the separation line in the introduction. 2. Author should include contributions of this study clearly. 3. The restructuring of subsections and renaming (e.g., "Connected Works" to "Related Work") improves alignment with academic standards. 4. Please cite the related works properly. (Such as I. Inuwa-Dutse, M. Liptrott, and I. Korkontzelos [1] presented the innovative method.....) 5. The literature review remains underwhelming despite renaming. The depth of critical analysis is still lacking compared to the recommendations. Including more recent references (2019 onward) would enrich this section. 6. A better connection between past studies and the proposed work is needed to establish a strong narrative of how this study builds on or differs from previous research. 7. While methodology details have improved, "Fig. 2. Flow of proposed Spam Detection System" remains inadequately explained. A step-by-step breakdown of how this flow relates to the proposed approach is still missing. 8. No major addition of a conceptual figure (abstract overview) as recommended by the reviewer. Including one would clarify the method better. 9. The discussion of results is minimal. For example, the manuscript lacks detailed analysis of why Enhanced Random Forest significantly outperforms Naive Bayes, especially in relation to the feature extraction process and specific dataset characteristics. 10. Comparative analysis with state-of-the-art methods, as suggested, is superficial. Quantitative comparisons with other advanced methods (e.g., deep learning-based spam detection) would provide better scientific robustness 11. Although significant improvements in grammar and flow were made, minor issues persist in readability and terminology precision (e.g., inconsistent use of technical terms and occasional awkward phrasing) 12. The conclusion lacks a strong discussion of broader implications. For example, how this system can be scaled or adapted to handle more complex spam detection scenarios or social media platforms could be expanded. 13. Author can follow the following paper to rewrite this manuscript and can cite it properly as required: Chakraborty, A., Das, U.K., Sikder, J., Maimuna, M., Sarek, K.I. (2023). Content Based Email Spam Classifier as a Web Application Using Naïve Bayes Classifier. In: Vasant, P., Weber, GW., Marmolejo-Saucedo, J.A., Munapo, E., Thomas, J.J. (eds) Intelligent Computing & Optimization. ICO 2022. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol 569. Springer, Cham. 	

FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19958-5_36

Recommendations:

- Further refine the **Connected Works** section with updated references and a clearer narrative connecting prior research to the current study.
- Improve **visual elements** in the methodology (e.g., abstract overview figure) and provide a detailed explanation for system flow diagrams.
- Expand the **results discussion** to include more in-depth comparative analyses and interpretations.
- Proofread again for minor grammatical errors and better flow.
- Strengthen the **conclusion** by discussing broader implications and future research directions.

PART 3: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS for this REVISED manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this REVISED manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept (8-10) Revision required: (4-8) Rejected: (0-4)	5

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Utpol Kanti Das
Department, University & Country	National Insitute of Textile Engineering and Research, Bangladesh