

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_101581
Title of the Manuscript:	FRAUD DETECTION OF AD CLICK USING MACHINE LEARNING TECHNIQUES
Type of the Article	Practical 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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article under review has a pronounced modern practical character. The authors tried to develop an algorithm for assessing fraud in advertising electronic materials and blocking them when detected. At present, this is a very urgent task.</p> <p>The title of the article suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the list of references to the sources used (References), the authors cited only Internet ones, but now there is a huge amount of educational literature on the issue under study and, in my opinion, such literature should be added when preparing an article for publication</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yakov G. Verkhivker
Department, University & Country	Odessa Technological University, Ukraine