

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JERR_123246</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>SENTIMENT ANALYSIS OF NIGERIAN OPINIONS USING LOGISTIC REGRESSION AND RANDOM FOREST ALGORITHMS</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

#### **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

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| 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.                        | In addition to various methods of analysis and processing, sentiment analysis is also known as comment mining, Natural Language Processing, text analysis, machine learning, and computer linguistics.. The majority of supervised learning is accomplished through the use of machine learning. |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)   | The article's title is appropriate for the content.  |   |
| 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.   | The abstract of the article is far too brief; it ought to highlight the significant finding that was obtained from this manuscript.  |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | The structure of the manuscript, including its subsections, is suitably organised.   |   |
| 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. | This manuscript is acceptable in terms of its scientific accuracy.   |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | Your references are adequate, but they are not recent; you should make an effort to reference within the last five years.  |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><br>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   | There are some sentences that may be difficult to understand, but the overall quality of the text is appropriate for scholarly publications.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  |  |   |

#### **PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

#### **Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | Supparang Ruangvanich                      |
| Department, University & Country | Chandrakasem Rajabhat University, Thailand |