

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_122783
Title of the Manuscript:	Sentiment Analysis Techniques: A Comparative Study of Logistic Regression, Random Forest, and Naive Bayes on General English and Nigerian Texts
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	The authors present robust data and innovative methodologies that could pave the way for future research and practical applications. I appreciate the manuscript's clarity and thoroughness, which make complex concepts accessible. However, some sections could benefit from additional detail to enhance comprehension and impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight Specific Metrics: Mention specific metrics like accuracy, precision, and recall to give a clearer picture of the model performance. • Clarify Dataset Details: Briefly describe the size and nature of the datasets used, especially the Nigerian dataset, to provide more context. • Include Practical Implications: Add a sentence about the practical implications of the findings, such as potential applications in business or social sciences. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Logical Flow: Ensure that the manuscript follows a logical progression from introduction to conclusion. Each section should build on the previous one. 2. Clarity and Focus: Each subsection should have a clear focus and contribute to the overall argument or findings of the manuscript. 3. Standard Structure: Typically, a scientific manuscript includes sections such as Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Ensure these sections are present and well-defined. 	
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.	Firstly, the manuscript demonstrates a thorough review of existing literature, ensuring that the research is grounded in established knowledge. Secondly, the methodology is clearly defined and appropriate for the research questions posed, which enhances the reliability and reproducibility of the results. Additionally, the data analysis is rigorous and employs suitable statistical techniques, providing robust and credible findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coverage: Ensure that the references cover all key aspects of the topic. They should include foundational studies as well as recent advancements. 2. Recency: Ideally, references should include recent publications from the last 5-10 years to reflect the current state of research. 3. Relevance: The references should be directly relevant to the research questions and methodology of the manuscript. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The grammar is mostly correct, but there are instances where sentence structure could be refined for better clarity.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Archana Balkrishna Yadav
Department, University & Country	Gujarat Technological University, India