
Subject: Misclassified as spam
Posted by [geotek](#) on Sat, 12 Mar 2005 13:32:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

report:
Content analysis details: (6.4 points, 5.2 required)

pts	rule name	description

0.0	NO_REAL_NAME	From: does not include a real name
-0.0	SPF_HELO_PASS	SPF: HELO matches SPF record
-0.0	SPF_PASS	SPF: sender matches SPF record
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_19	BODY: 1alpha-pock-9alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_75	BODY: 7alpha-pock-5alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_34	BODY: 3alpha-pock-4alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_102	BODY: 10alpha-pock-2alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_33	BODY: 3alpha-pock-3alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_84	BODY: 8alpha-pock-4alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_74	BODY: 7alpha-pock-4alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_53	BODY: 5alpha-pock-3alpha
0.6	J_CHICKENPOX_73	BODY: 7alpha-pock-3alpha
1.0	MIME_HTML_MAIN	BODY: Multipart message mostly text/html MIME
0.0	HTML_MESSAGE	BODY: HTML included in message
0.2	BAYES_50	BODY: Bayesian spam probability is 40 to 60% [score: 0.5000]
0.2	HTML_10_20	BODY: Message is 10% to 20% HTML
0.0	MIME_QP_LONG_LINE	RAW: Quoted-printable line longer than 76 chars
-0.5	AWL	AWL: From: address is in the auto white-list

It appears to me that the J_CHICKENFOX / alpha-pock rule is responsible for classification. Could you please explain, what is going on here? What does CHICKENFOX mean, anyway?
