

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_115771
Title of the Manuscript:	ENSEMBLE LEARNING BASED PREDICTION FOR CYBER HARASSMENT OBSERVATIONS ON TWEETS
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The articles you create are very important to provide security when using social media today. However, after I read it further, it seems like there needs to be a lot of improvement in the article you wrote.</li> <li>From the conclusions presented, it seems to discuss more about the use of the RF+DT and SVM+LR systems. It's a bit of a departure from the title of the research.</li> <li>The explanation given in the abstract is somewhat confusing. It is said that the RF+DT and SVM+LR systems provide the same results. Even though there is a difference in value of 1%.</li> <li>The presentation of the writing provided is a bit messy. Some paragraphs and images are not given a more detailed explanation, causing ambiguous interpretation. The numbering of the images is also irregular. Maybe it can be made more neat and systematic again.</li> <li>After I read this article further, and read the conclusions given from using RF+DT and SVM+LR for use on social media, I think there is still a lot of improvement needed. Because the title and discussion provided are not appropriate</li> <li>Please use more updated references. Please use references from the last 10 years, this of course provides a better reference considering the use of social media has grown since 2006. Please improve your reference writing and adapt it to a template that suits this journal.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	No.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	I think there needs to be some improvement in the use of sentences. It was still found that there was only 1 sentence without any supporting sentences. Because I think in 1 paragraph there are at least 3 sentences.	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>I Made Aditya Nugraha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Marine and Fisheries Polytechnic, Indonesia</b>