

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_117163
Title of the Manuscript:	Sentiment Classification of Safaricom PLC Social Media Sentiments on X
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

(<https://www.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 thereview form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the topic is a good subject.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>After checking, I think that the manuscript is correct.</p> <p>The good papers should be added to the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Generally well-written paper, to improve the quality of the paper, please check your sentences and/or English one more time.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Title: Unsteady scalar reaction-diffusion problems using finite volume, finite element, and finite difference approaches</p> <p>Major comments:</p> <p>1. The title should be short.</p> <p>2. The abstract is clumsy and unclear. It should be concisely written to make the objective clear and brief the outcome (possibly, five to six sentences for this article).</p> <p>3. The introduction section, especially the literature review on the considered model (1), is very poor and unconvincing. This section needs to be rewritten completely new with appropriate references and statements. I cannot write all the related references to scalar reaction-diffusion problems here and I ask the author to do a proper review on the equation checking for the existing results with different methods, gaps arising there, and write how</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>the present work can fill the gaps.</p> <p>4. The author has not studied any dynamics. They have given plot for particular choice of parameters and this cannot be regarded as clear study.</p> <p>5. Plenty of irrelevant references are included, while significantly related/required works are missed.</p> <p>6. What is the main contribution of this paper? It should be explained in detail.</p> <p>7. Generally well-written paper, to improve the quality of the paper, please check your sentences and/or English one more time.</p> <p>8. Keywords should not include the word that existed in the title.</p> <p>9. It is better to add some ideas for future work in the Section of the Conclusion.</p> <p>10. Have you employed any assumptions? Please explain.</p> <p>11. Please check abstract and correct verb time.</p> <p>*Please check the end of expression including "comma" and "point" in all paper.</p> <p>12. The authors need to add a section as discussion and results.</p> <p>13. The paper lacks physical prospects. Add physical explanation in the discussion section.</p> <p>14. The graphical visualization is not clear I am trying to understand the behaviour of the graphs but the given information according to my point of view is not sufficient share the source how we visualize the graphs and check their accuracy. So, paste all computational work here.</p> <p>15. The following papers should be added to the paper:</p> <p>The Solution of the Variable Coefficients Fourth-Order Parabolic Partial Differential Equations by the Homotopy Perturbation Method, Zeitschrift für Naturforschung A-A Journal of Physical Sciences, 64a, 420 – 430 (2009)</p> <p>Study of the wave-breaking's qualitative behavior of the Fornberg-Whitham equation via quasi-numeric approaches, International Journal of Numerical Methods for Heat & Fluid Flow, Vol. 22 No. 5, (2012) 537-553.</p> <p>Solving the integro-differential equations using the modified Laplace Adomian decomposition Method, Journal of Mathematical Extension, 6(1), (2012) 1-15.</p> <p>Numerical treatment of Benjamin-Bona-Mahony equation by using Alpert Multiwavelets, European Physical Journal Plus, (2018), 133:201</p> <p>An optimal galerkin-homotopy asymptotic method applied to the nonlinear second-order bvps. Proc Inst Math Mech 2021;47(1):156–82.</p> <p>An analytical analysis to solve the fractional differential equations. Adv Math Models Appl 2021;6(2):128–61.</p>	
	<p>16. Authors should offer another example with computing the error and Error Table and plot for comparing the errors.</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:	Jalil Manafian
Department, University & Country	University of Tabriz, Iran