

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_101251
Title of the Manuscript:	HATE SPEECH DETECTION USING DECISION TREE ALGORITHM
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. The freedom of expression especially in social media is abused to incite hatred against individuals or groups of people which is addressed by the feature engineering techniques and machine learning algorithms to automatically detect hate speech posts. Yes</p> <p>The abstract needs to be further revised. The sentences are not complete. The experimental results can be included to highlight the research study.</p> <p>Yes. But the methodology section must be numbered as III instead of II.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The references listed are sufficient. Few other recent references can be included.</p> <p>The word breaking in article need to be fixed since it is very difficult to read. The figure mentioned in the methodology section is not available. Uniformity in labelling the figures is appreciated. The obtained results can be consolidated and discussed before the conclusion section. The future enhancement can be pointed at the end of the conclusion setcion</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality can be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Sathya Bama
Department, University & Country	India