

1. REVIEWED BY (Your first and last name): Hans Peterson.
2. DRAFT AUTHOR (First and last name of the person who wrote the paper): Nicholas Samonte.
3. YES OR NO: Does the paper appear to be at least 75% complete? (Feel free to add any additional comments, e.g., if it was submitted as is, do you think it'd get a passing grade?)

Yes. The paper is complete and would get a passing grade.

4. ASSESSMENT: Does the paper address every point listed above under the "Paper Guidelines" and "Paper Content & Format" headings? Provide brief but specific details about what is included and what is missing. Address content and mechanics; explain and provide evidence to support your claims:

Most of the "Paper Guidelines" have been completed, and all headings are in place, but there are a few issues.

- The guidelines suggest that titles are written in title case, not all caps.
The title would then be "Real-Time Detection and Response to Email Phishing Attacks: Challenges and Solutions of Artificial Intelligence."
- Excluding the title, abstract, and references, the paper seems to exceed the 2000-word requirement, as specified in the guidelines. I'm unsure if this would deduct points from the total grade, but if it does, the paper should be edited for conciseness. Sentences should be restructured to eliminate redundancies while retaining their original meanings.
- On the key terms page, the key terms being defined may need to be italicized, as specified in the guidelines.

For example, one of the key terms is phishing. "According to Khan, a cybersecurity researcher, **phishing** is a method . . ."

Here, phishing should be italicized: "According to Khan, a cybersecurity researcher, *phishing* is a method . . ."

Another key term is artificial intelligence. I'm unsure whether or not the abbreviation (AI) should be spelled out throughout the key terms paragraph.

- This is more of a nitpick. The assignment due date on the cover sheet (title page) should be updated to “November 23, 2024,” as the final paper submission due date is on November 23.

5. Content issues: Is there a need to clarify concepts, or reorganize paragraphs or sentences in paragraphs?

There are no content issues throughout the paragraphs; rather, they flow logically. However, there are redundancies in sentences that could be eliminated for conciseness.

6. Issues with syntax, grammar, and mechanics. For example, indicate but don't correct spelling and punctuation errors, as well as verb tense, pronoun agreement, and comma splices.

There is one double space between words. “In order to properly shed light on the broader implications of AI's role.” In Word format, since the text wraps around, the double space isn't visible.

Most of the syntax, grammar, and mechanics are good. A few verb tenses may need to be corrected.

In particular, I'm curious if the **could** below should be a **can** instead.

“In solving this problem, the system **could** integrate AI-driven education capabilities that allow users to learn in real-time without compromising on speedier detection, as proposed by Kuraku et al. (2024).”

7. APA citation issues, including in-text and bibliographic citations.

There are no capitalization issues for references. However, the first reference from “Bešić M.” may need to be placed underneath the reference for “Atlam, H.F., & Oluwatimilehin, O.” Otherwise, the rest of the references are sorted alphabetically by author's last name.

A few in-text citations may need to be corrected. Example: “This research also places emphasis on real-time detection, which, according to Thakur, 2023, refers to the system responding within seconds to the detected cyber threats . . . ”

“Thakur, 2023, refers to the . . . ” may need to be corrected to “Thakur (2023), to the . . . ”

A few in-text citations lack the year of publication. Example: “Accountability in AI-driven cybersecurity systems is a concern, according to Qabajeh et al., when AI . . . ”

- 8. At the end of your assessment, comment briefly on at least two points (in approximately two sentences) regarding what is done well and/or what needs work.**

Near the end of the introduction paragraph, the justification for the research is well-done: it relates back to the course, the major, and it also suggests that the research is practical to advancing cybersecurity and eliminating a growing problem (phishing).

A few of the in-text citations within the paragraphs warrant closer attention (as some lack parentheses and year of publication). Otherwise, many of the paragraphs are exceptionally written and, most importantly, flow logically.