

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_107390
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYZING ELECTION SENTIMENTS IN TWEETS WITH GATED RECURRENT UNITS (GRU)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 manuscript is important for the scientific community GRUs are a type of neural network that is well-suited for processing sequential data, such as text AND it contributes to our understanding of how people use social media to express their political views</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the paper, which is the use of Gated Recurrent Units (GRU) to analyze election sentiments in tweets.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The authors also discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The authors cite a variety of relevant sources, including recent papers on Gated Recurrent Units and sentiment analysis.</p> <p>Overall, I think the manuscript is well-written and informative. It makes a significant contribution to the field of sentiment analysis, and it is likely to be of interest to a wide range of researchers</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Small correction for spelling mistake such as : Spelling mistake. "emphases", the plural form of the noun 'emphasis'?. Better be "emphases" (but not too essential)</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:	Edy Fradinata
Department, University & Country	Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia