

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_116856
Title of the Manuscript:	Sentiment Analysis by Hierarchical Deep Neural Networks for Audience Opinion Mining
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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript on Sentiment Analysis by Hierarchical Deep Neural Networks based on Rhetorical Structure Theory is important for the scientific community, particularly in the field of natural language processing and sentiment analysis. The innovative approach of integrating RST with HRNN addresses key limitations of traditional sentiment analysis methods, such as the inability to capture discourse structure and nuanced sentiment nuances. This research contributes significantly to the advancement of sentiment analysis techniques, offering a more comprehensive and accurate way of analyzing and understanding textual data, which has wide-ranging applications in areas such as marketing, customer service, and social media analysis.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the purpose, methodology, key findings, and significance of the research in a concise manner, providing a clear overview of what the manuscript involves.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. They provide a clear and organized framework for presenting the research methodology, findings, and conclusions, making it easy for readers to follow the flow of information and understand the study's progression.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. YES</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	YES	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Amrapali Prakash Tribhuvan
Department, University & Country	Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, India