

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_97066</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CONTENT-BASED FILTERING AND WEB SCRAPING IN WEBSITE FOR RECOMMEND ANIME</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The proposed work fits into the Recommendation Systems field. The manuscript presents a research study aiming to determine the user's satisfaction level of an anime recommendation application using Delone and Mclean model. Authors have proceeded to experiment their application through a set of 43 users and they obtained 74, 23% of satisfaction.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable to the manuscript content.</p> <p>3. The abstract resume and cover the proposed ideas</p> <p>4. The manuscript structure is not appropriate and need to be revised:</p> <p>4.1. Section 2 contains seven sub-sections presenting some literature review. However, the presented themes are not related to each other. The reader will have some difficulties to follow and to understand the goal of presenting these themes for the proposed research study.</p> <p>4.2. Sub-section 2.7 is very poor and need to be more detailed. It presents the research key part; thus, it has to provide the necessary information about the used model so that the reader would be able to understand.</p> <p>4.3. Section 3 contains a single sub-section (3.1) which is not acceptable; it has to contain at least two.</p> <p>4.4. The last section (Conclusion) is the fifth (5) one and not the forth (4).</p> <p>5. The paper aims to propose a recommendation application that can achieve an acceptable user satisfaction level. Having this purpose in mind some scientific limitations have been arisen :</p> <p>5.1. To test the application performance, authors have proceeded to a questionnaire. However, the questions were very general and do not cover the specefity of an anime recommendation. In fact, they have to precise categories, genres and studios.</p> <p>5.2. The collected dataset contains just 43 users. It is a very poor set for a questionnaire-based research study. It has to be enriched in order to obtain more accurate results.</p> <p>5.3. In scientific researches, having 100% of precision and 100% of accuracy is a little bit confusing! In fact, these results were obtained after one single test, namely, "predicting the results of recommendations that have the word 'night' in the title or anime synopsis." This single test is not sufficient for testing an algorithm. Actually, a series of tests is needed to reflect the performance of the used algorithm.</p> <p>6. References are recent and cover the whole discussed themes. However, they have to be alphabetically reorganized.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The paper should be revised in order to improve the quality of the English:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are plenty of long and very long sentences, which make it very difficult to read.</li> <li>- There are plenty of orthographic and grammatical errors</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Djellal Asma
Department, University & Country	Ecole Supérieur de Comptabilité et de Finance de Constantine, Algeria