

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_123246
Title of the Manuscript:	SENTIMENT ANALYSIS OF NIGERIAN OPINIONS USING LOGISTIC REGRESSION AND RANDOM FOREST ALGORITHMS
Type of the Article	Research paper

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This research offers a comparative study between Logistic Regression and Random Forest in sentiment analysis. Extensive testing and a comparative study of classification algorithms offer important new perspectives on the possible applications of NLP domain. The results of the study have great potential to enhance the sentiment analysis model</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>SENTIMENT ANALYSIS OF NIGERIAN OPINIONS USING LOGISTIC REGRESSION AND RANDOM FOREST ALGORITHMS : A COMPARITIVE STUDY</p> <p>I suggest to add a “comparative study” in the title</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>1- The main contribution is not cleared in the abstract 2- The last line in abstract should include the final result of the paper you must added it 3- At the beginning you should explain why the sentiment analysis is important in one line</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The paper needs to Restructure the main heading as bellow: Introduction Related works Materials and method Methodology Result Conclusion References</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This paper presents a comparison between two algorithms in sentiment analysis system by using different performance criteria such as Recall, f1-score, Accuracy. also the authors display a results in the figures which make the comparative between two algorithm more clearly</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I suggest to add more reference related to existing sentiment analysis model that using the same used dataset or the same used methodology</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality is good!</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Did the author check if the data is biased? Although the study contrasts the effects of several categorization algorithms, a more thorough comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of each method could improve the results even more.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Maria Mohammad Fawzi Yousef
Department, University & Country	Middel East University, Jordan