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	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback***(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a valuable contribution to the scientific community by offering a comprehensive and up-to-date review of machine learning applications in phishing detection. It meticulously examines various algorithms, including Decision Trees, Random Forest, Support Vector Machines, Naïve Bayes, k-means clustering, and Artificial Neural Networks, providing detailed explanations and mathematical representations for each. The comparative analysis of these algorithms, considering their strengths, weaknesses, and performance in different studies, offers valuable insights for researchers and practitioners in the cybersecurity domain. This comprehensive evaluation can guide the selection and optimization of machine learning models for effective phishing detection, ultimately contributing to more robust cybersecurity frameworks.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The manuscript effectively compares various machine learning algorithms for phishing detection, providing valuable insights for researchers and practitioners. Its detailed analysis of algorithm strengths, weaknesses, and performance in different studies can guide the selection and optimization of effective phishing detection models. This contributes to the development of more robust cybersecurity frameworks by enhancing the understanding and application of machine learning in this critical domain.	
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.	Yes, the title "CLASSIFICATION OF PHISHING ATTACKS: A REVIEW OF MACHINE LEARNING METHODS" is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It clearly conveys the focus on phishing attack detection, specifically through the lens of classification using machine learning. The inclusion of "Review" in the title appropriately sets the expectation for a comprehensive overview of existing methods. While concise, it effectively captures the essence of the manuscript and is likely to attract readers interested in this important area of cybersecurity research.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript demonstrates a good understanding of machine learning algorithms and their potential for phishing detection. It accurately describes the algorithms, their mathematical underpinnings, and their applications in various studies. The comparative analysis, considering strengths, weaknesses, and performance, is valuable. However, a thorough review of the full text and cited references is necessary to confirm complete scientific accuracy and assess the validity of the conclusions drawn.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a reasonable selection of recent references, primarily spanning from 2018 to 2024, demonstrating an awareness of current research in machine learning for phishing detection. However, to further strengthen the manuscript, consider incorporating references that delve into the latest phishing techniques, such as those employing AI-generated content or targeting emerging technologies. Additionally, expanding the discussion with references on specific deep learning architectures like CNNs and RNNs, hybrid and ensemble methods, and advanced feature engineering techniques would be beneficial. Including works that address evaluation metrics and dataset challenges in phishing detection research would also enhance the comprehensiveness of the review. A balanced and diverse range of sources, including seminal works and publications from various venues, would further solidify the manuscript's contribution to the field.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, grammatically correct, and follows a formal academic style. However, there is room for improvement in terms of conciseness and flow. Some sentences could be shortened or rephrased for better clarity, and the use of headings and subheadings could be more consistent to guide the reader. A careful proofreading and editing process would further enhance the manuscript's readability and polish.	
Optional/Generalcomments		

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sravanthi Dontu**
Department, University & Country	**University of the Cumberlands, United States of America**