

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_110806
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) problem using Machine learning techniques
Type of the 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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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 addresses a significant area in natural language processing, focusing on Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) using various machine learning techniques. Given the growing interest in NLP and its applications, this research contributes to understanding and improving MRC systems, particularly in multilingual contexts. However, the manuscript's impact would be stronger with a more explicit discussion of its implications for real-world applications and its potential to address gaps in current MRC research. 2. The title appropriately reflects the manuscript's content, focusing on MRC and machine learning techniques. It is clear, concise, and accurately presents the research's scope. 3. The abstract provides a reasonable overview of the research, including the problem addressed, methodologies used (logistic regression, KNN, and random forest), and a brief mention of the outcomes. However, it could be enhanced by including more specific results and implications of the study. Moreover, a clearer articulation of how this work differs from or advances existing research in MRC would be beneficial. 4. In reviewing the manuscript structure, it is evident that while it includes basic sections on methodology and experimentation, these areas require significant enhancement. The methodology section, currently brief and lacking depth, should be expanded to thoroughly explain the selection and implementation of machine learning techniques, providing detailed parameter settings and theoretical justifications. Similarly, the experimentation section appears overly simplistic. It would benefit from more varied and rigorous testing scenarios, including diverse datasets and comparisons with state-of-the-art methods. This expansion and deepening of content are crucial for adequately demonstrating the validity and novelty of the research within the field of Machine Reading Comprehension. 5. Probably correct 6. The manuscript includes a range of references, suggesting a comprehensive literature review. However, to further enhance the paper, additional references comparing the proposed techniques with the latest advancements in MRC could be beneficial. Moreover, citing recent studies from the last 2-3 years would demonstrate the manuscript's relevance and up-to-date nature in the rapidly evolving field of NLP. <p>Overall, the structure of the article is correct; however, the content is incomplete. It lacks a detailed description of the various components of the MRC method, and the experimentation is insufficient. Additionally, the references are outdated, with a lack of literature from the past three years. It is hoped that the author will undertake serious revisions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kexin Jiang
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science, South China Business College of Guangdong, University of Foreign Studies, China