

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_109603
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploratory Search Prompt Generation using n-degree connection in Knowledge Graph
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript makes valuable contributions to the scientific community. It addresses the issue of suboptimal search results, a critical aspect in information retrieval. Furthermore, the methodologies employed, regarding n-degree connections in knowledge graphs, contribute to the methodological toolkit of the scientific community in both information retrieval tasks and the field of graph machine learning. The manuscript not only advances our understanding of query generation techniques in knowledge graphs but also establishes a foundation for future research and discussions in the field. Overall, this work presents an interesting and effective approach for retrieving information from interconnected data.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is clear and informative, conveying the main focus of the article.</p> <p>3. Yes, the provided abstract is comprehensive as it effectively outlines the motivation, the challenge addressed, the proposed solution, and the benefits of the approach. Perhaps the authors should explicitly mention the key findings or results obtained from the experiments to provide a concise summary for readers.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure of the manuscript is consistent with established scientific standards. However, the authors might want to consider dividing the introduction. Specifically, the part discussing knowledge graphs should be placed in a new section or incorporated into the second one.</p> <p>5. Yes, I believe the manuscript is scientifically sound. Overall, the manuscript adheres to scientific principles and standards.</p> <p>6. Yes, the provided references are relevant to the topic of knowledge graphs and machine learning. The authors could consider incorporating additional references related to prompt generation or query annotation techniques.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language employed in the article reaches appropriate levels of scientific language. Additionally, the article is relatively well-structured, making it easily readable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Even though figures contribute to a more appealing appearance of the article and consequently enhance its readability, we should use images to which we at least partially refer in the text. On that note, I don't believe that Fig. 2 adds any value to help readers better understand the topic. Furthermore, the scales on Figures 4 and 5 are not sufficiently clear and should be corrected appropriately.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marko Možina
Department, University & Country	University of Ljubljana, Slovenia