

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_112458
Title of the Manuscript:	Deep Learning Approach for Classification of Tweets in Detecting Cyber Truculent
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The authors used the word truculent 9 times in the paper and 7 of those are in the title and abstract while the word bullying was used in the body of the text 33 times. So, I would suggest replacing Truculent with Bullying in the rest of the text.</p> <p>Maybe. It describes the solution but doesn't make the problem very obvious.</p> <p>No. For instance, the literature review is called "Materials and Methods" and the content of the introduction does not introduce the problem and just scratches the surface of what AI and NLP can do with language.</p> <p>No. I consider 10 references very small for a topic that has so much interest and attention in the research community. More so, the in-text citations and references don't match. For instance, the second reference in the introduction (agrawal & awekar, 2018), is not listed in the references. The presence of [22] in the Materials and Methods section when there are only 10 items in the references list is also an indication of academic misconduct and was the particular red flag that made me conduct a plagiarism check.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, to some extent.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This work, the way it has been written at the moment, does not indicate that the said research has been carried out.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Damilola Akinyemi
Department, University & Country	University of York, United Kingdom