

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_97831
Title of the Manuscript:	SENTIMENTS ANALYSIS STUDY FOR THE ADAPTATION OF ONLINE MEDICAL FORUMS
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	yes can be reframed yes but make it more abstract with less number of words.It should briefly tell the entire work and output make meaningful subsections like introduction then literature survey. Work is fine for scientific community references are ok Format has to be changed .Do not keep code part in a paper. Can do analysis and add in table format	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is just fine, ca be modified	
Optional/General comments	paper should be modified by adding certain analysis like tables. Do not keep code part in a paper. It should be reframed	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Minu P Abraham
Department, University & Country	N.M.A.M. Institute of Technology, India