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**Individual Report**

**Member name:** [Rahul Nayak](mailto:rrnayak@asu.edu)

**Evaluated by:** [Anuranjan Dubey](mailto:adubey37@asu.edu)[Gautham Vijayaraj](mailto:gvijaya6@asu.edu)
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**Tasks Assigned:**

* Work on individual in-depth report
* Preparing individual progress report
* Working on Mid term review report
* Evaluating Avani’s individual progress report and in-depth report

**Summary:**

* Over the past few weeks, I've been immersing myself in research papers concerning different forms of Suspicious behavior occurring on social media platforms. Last week I worked on studying a paper related to detecting spam accounts on twitter. This week, my focus will be delving extensively into the topic of spam accounts on Sina Weibo chinese social media platform and different methods the authors used in data collection and feature selection for classifying the accounts to be spam or not spam.
* The paper discusses the detection of suspicious activities on social media, with a focus on spamming as one type of malicious activity. It presents a solution based on data mining and machine learning, specifically using Support Vector Machines (SVM), to effectively detect spammers on the Sina Weibo social network.
* The paper acknowledges that the popularity of social networks has also attracted a significant increase in social spam, which includes behaviors like posting commercial URLs and following numerous users. This spamming can lead to misunderstanding and inconvenience for users.
* The main goal of the paper is to propose a machine learning-based solution for effective spammer detection on Sina Weibo.
* The authors in the paper collected a dataset from Sina Weibo, including over 30,000 users and more than 16 million messages.
* They manually classified users into spammers and non-spammers and extracted features from message content and user behavior. These features are then used in an SVM-based spammer detection algorithm.
* As this paper still has more content and study on Dataset collection and analysis, I will be providing an in depth study about this next week.

**Outcome:**

Overall, the paper focuses on the problem of spam detection in social media, particularly on Sina Weibo, and presents a machine learning-based solution that demonstrates high accuracy in distinguishing spammers from legitimate users. This relates to the broader topic of detecting suspicious activities on social media with spamming being a significant form of malicious activity.  
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**Evaluation of Report  
  
Evaluation by:** [Anuranjan Dubey](mailto:adubey37@asu.edu) **Date: 24th September 2023**

**Is the weekly member report complete with all the major result(s) of the paper(s)? If not, provide as many examples of the major result(s) missing in the written report as possible. (in bullet form). [within 100 words]**

* The report outlines the paper's focus on detecting spam accounts on the Sina Weibo social media platform using data mining and machine learning, specifically Support Vector Machines (SVM).
* It mentions specific details such as the collection of a dataset from Sina Weibo, which were manually classified into spammers and non-spammers for feature extraction.
* The report summarizes that the paper presents a machine learning-based solution with high accuracy in distinguishing spammers from legitimate users on Sina Weibo

**Is each section of the guidelines sufficiently completed? If not, point out what is missing. [Normally within 40 words].**

Yes, each section of the guidelines is sufficiently completed.

**Is the quality of this version of the written report satisfactory? If not, then why not? [Normally within 40 words]**

Yes. The quality of this version of the written report is satisfactory.

**Approved by:** [Gautham Vijayaraj](mailto:gvijaya6@asu.edu) **Date: 24th September 2023**