

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_128845
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSIFICATION OF PHISHING ATTACKS: A REVIEW OF MACHINE LEARNING METHODS
Type of the Article	review article

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This review manuscript provides a comprehensive evaluation of machine learning algorithms for phishing detection, addressing a critical challenge in cybersecurity. It serves as a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners by highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of various methods, which could guide the development of more robust detection systems. The discussion on feature optimization and algorithm comparison is insightful, making it particularly relevant in advancing machine learning applications in cybersecurity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear, concise, and accurately represents the content of the manuscript. No changes are suggested.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the key aspects of the paper effectively. It clearly states the focus, methods, and findings. However, it could briefly mention the challenges discussed (e.g., computational complexity or dataset limitations) to provide a holistic overview.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It appropriately uses mathematical representations to explain algorithms and references recent and relevant studies. The comparative analysis is thorough, and the findings are well-supported.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, covering recent works from 2018–2024, which ensures relevance. However, including more references on ensemble or hybrid methods for phishing detection could strengthen the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. A few grammatical errors and overly long sentences should be corrected to improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A summary table of key findings from the literature review could enhance clarity for readers. Future work could explore the integration of explainable AI (XAI) to improve the interpretability of phishing detection models. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohit Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Bharati Vidyapeeth's College of Engineering, India