

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_113437
Title of the Manuscript:	Sarcasm Detection in Pidgin Tweets
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <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 the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The subjective of this article can navigate the linguistic complexity of Pidgin, adapt to informal language conventions, and successfully discern sarcasm in this distinctive context.</p> <p>2. "Sarcasm Detection in Pidgin Tweets" is too broad. I would recommend it to focus on the key concepts.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a good review of the study objectives, The findings and conclusions and their significance are clearly summarized in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Structure of manuscript is well organized. Introduction provides a good background. However, do not begin the sentence with the reference no. Example related work section. The Figure 4 is not referred inside the text. What makes the proposed model to achieve better results? This discussion must be provided.</p> <p>5. The manuscript looks scientifically ok to me.</p> <p>6. Yes, relevant and adequate references are there.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is clear to communicate the content</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	N. Nirmalajyothi
Department, University & Country	VNR Vignana Jyothi Institute of Engineering and Technology, India