

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_110372
Title of the Manuscript:	Classifying Bengali Newspaper Headlines with Advanced Deep Learning Models: LSTM, Bi-LSTM, and Bi-GRU Approaches
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- the manuscript has an important issue for scientific community as it deals with a good subject in natural language processing field 2- yes, title of the article is suitable 3- yes , the abstract of the article Is comprehensive 4- yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5- yes , the manuscript is scientifically correct 6- yes, the references are sufficient and recent <p>The manuscript, entitled " Classifying Bengali Newspaper Headlines with Advanced Deep Learning Models: LSTM, Bi-LSTM, and Bi-GRU Approaches " has been subjected to our normal review process, after considering 1- Materials & methods 2- Results & discussion 3- statistical analyses 4- Conclusion 5- references 6- weaknesses 7- how can author strengthen the paper the summary of report as follow;</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Recommendation: Reconsider after minor revisions</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>The work done is acceptable for publication but required a minor improvement as below suggestions.</p> <p>Weaknesses and strengthen points and our Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic formatting does not need to be further processed. 2. Language issue – no need to improve English writing. 3. The author avoids using analogy for scientific writing in the paper. 4. No need to rephrase paragraphs, due to clear sentences and absence of confusing words. 5. The paper is clear, concise, and well organized). 6. Reference in text is correct and valuable. 7. Tables in the paper are well organized as per proposed mathematical model. 8. A comparison study for natural language processing can be achieved via different algorithms and ways; there is a good highlight for the procedure of how to choose the proposed method. 9. Explanation of Table in text is very good, and relatable to the experiment setup and results. 10. figures , graphs and tables clearly explains the methodology, results and findings. 11. results had an excellent validation with other recent published papers in perfect journals in the related feild 12. The research results are significant enough to lead to an incremental advance 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>and contribution in the NLP field.</p> <p>13. The manuscript's writing language and style does not need significant improvement.</p> <p>14. The abstract include the specifications of the new study fully, also researchers gave a good picture for the new results compared to previous studies.</p> <p>15. the literature review well organized appear as per the date of time from the old to the modern.</p> <p>16. the objectives of the current study clearly identified in the paper.</p> <p>17. There are little mistakes due to impermissible use of the pronouns of th speakers in his research book, such as our, we .</p> <p>18. The title of the paper accurately reflect the major focus contribution of this paper</p> <p>19. The abstract is an appropriate and adequate digest of the work</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No additional comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ibraheem Hatem Al-Dosari
Department, University & Country	Al-Rafidain University College, Iraq