

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_126159
Title of the Manuscript:	Application Natural Language Processing (NLP) For Multilingual Tourism: Google Translate For Effectiveness Communication
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript titled "Application of Natural Language Processing (NLP) for Multilingual Tourism: Google Translate for Effective Communication" presents a valuable opportunity for contribution in the fields of NLP and tourism. Just a few months ago, I worked on a paper closely related to NLP using machine learning, which makes this study particularly intriguing and relevant to me. I see considerable potential in the concepts with great scope to enrichments and significances for enhancing multilingual communication in the tourism sector.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	There is a minor grammatical mistake in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Everything seems fine. Still the sentence "The main findings of this study..." seems verbose and difficult to understand by readers. It is suggested to use 16-18 words in a sentences maximum.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The part 1: introduction seems too big in size involving 2 data tables in it. I think much of the detailed explanations can be done as subsections after introduction as 1.1 and 1.2 etc.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The results mentioned in this article include enhancing accessibility, overcoming linguistic barriers. Although these goals are in line with many NLP technologies, specific evidence is needed to support these conclusions. In order to assess translation quality, previous NLP research frequently uses BLEU or METEOR scores or controlled user trials, which would enhance scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References seems fine. Most of the references used are done after 2020.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is moderately suitable now and can be improved much.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. For Table 2. Phrase translate scoring and evaluation techniques and results need to be clearly outlined. 2. The methodology of this article takes Simultaneously selected “20” samples with no calculated sample size considerations based on population size. There is a formula to confirm how many sample needs to be analysed for a study.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fajle Rabbi
Department, University & Country	Sonargaon University, Bangladesh