

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_127091
Title of the Manuscript:	Annotated Bangla Natural Language Processing (BNLP) Using Python and Machine Learning
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
-		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The authors organized the article to summarize just their work while it should initially contain the background study, the research gap and then the objectives of this study. Finally, the abstract should contain the methods they developed.2. Introduction section seems structures as it should be. It would have been better if they added more references of their study.3. In the literature review section, the authors didn't highlight the limitations of the previous studies.4. In the proposed methodology, the authors used only traditional models for training purpose. The authors didn't build any unique model. They contributed by creating a user-friendly interface. Furthermore, there is no description on how the dataset is created, how they are annotated and any snapshots of the used dataset.5. Finally, most of the references are not cited along the texts. The reference style and the paper structure should be structured according to the journal's policy. Final Comment: Major revision Needed.	

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:	Fahima Hossain
Department, University & Country	Jagannath University, Bangladesh