**Here in (Automatic Detection of Cyberbullying on Social Networks based on Bullying Features)** They propose a framework specific to cyberbullying detection using word embeddings that makes a list of pre-defined insulting words and assign different weights to obtain bullying features, which are then concatenated with Bag-of-Words and latent semantic features to form the final representation before feeding them into a linear SVM classifier.Thier problem that cyberbullying is a binary classification .they collected a dataset from twitter then they preprocess the dataset by removing the special characters including user mentions and urls and replace them by predefined characters. They used tfidf, latent semantic features and bullying features that comes from insulting seeds as feature extraction. The results of these framework was 79.4 as a recall.

In paper (Cyberbullying Detection and Prevention: DataMining and Psychological Perspective) they get their dataset from Myspace and manually marked them manually and these cause weakness in their dataset and they used stemming and stop word removal from as preprocesses. Then they used sentiment analysis and SVM classifier.

In this paper **(Detecting Offensive Language in Social Media to Protect Adolescent Online Safety)** they propose the Lexical Syntactic Feature (LSF) architecture to detect offensive words in social media they have results 98.24% as precision and 94.34% as recall in sentence offensive detection they have the dataset from YouTube comments and they have bag of words as feature extraction but the fact that Bag of words leads to high false positive.

*Here in this paper(Detection and Prevention measures for Cyberbullying and Online Grooming)* They made watch dog application that detect offensive words and images they have used sentiment analysis and adult image algorithm .They collected their dataset from user messages. Sentiment analysis is not enough because the computer cannot detect sarcasm.

(Towards the Detection of Cyberbullying Based on Social Network Mining Techniques) They propose a technique based on SNM .they collected the dataset from social media then the used SNA measurements and Sentiments as features. In this work they made 7 experiments .they have results precision accuracy is around **0.79** and the recall around 0.71.the accuracy of this work is too weak.

In This paper (Automated Cyberbullying Detection using Clustering Appearance Patterns) enhanced the Naïve Bayes classifier for extracting the words and examining loaded pattern clustering. They proposed a method that resulted increasing accuracy and reliability of an experiment. Texts are fed into cluster and discriminant analysis stage which is able to identify abusive texts. The abusive texts are then clustered by using K-Mean. Naïve Bayes is used as classification algorithms to build a classifier from their training datasets that builds a predictive model. They used naïve Bayes to classify the abusive text from 1 to 8. The categories contains communicative, activities approach, compliment, desensitization, isolation, reframing, personal information and relationship. Naïve Bayes performs the classification accuracy = 95.79%.

The purpose of this research (Cyberbullying Classification using Text Mining)is to construct a classification model with optimal accuracy in identifying cyberbully conversation using Naive Bayes method and Support Vector Machine (SVM) then applying n-gram 1 to 5 for the number of class 2, 4, and 11 for each method. Naive Bayes yields an average accuracy of 92.81%, SVM with a poly kernel yields an Average accuracy of 97.11%.This work leads to high false positive because they are not using anything to deal with sarcasm in text.

Here in (Automatic Sarcasm Detection using feature selection) the primary goal of this research paper is to understand different methods for Automatic sarcasm detection. this paper describes techniques used for studying the various approaches available in Automatic Sarcasm Detection Field. They have used SVM classifier and it results F1 Score (0.41) with n gram and it results (0.56) with sentiment. The problem here that SVM need to be more precise in their analysis.