

Manuscript: “**Sentiment Analysis Models for Mapping Public Engagement on Twitter Data**”

Submitted: 06 April 2020

Accepted: 30 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding author: Yulius Denny Prabowo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p135](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p135)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gomathy.C.K
India

Reviewer 2: Emad Kasasbh Mutah
University Jordan

Reviewer 3: Andrea Corradini,
Copenhagen School of Design and Technology

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr.C.K.Gomathy	Email:
University/Country:India	
Date Manuscript Received:May 26- 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 30 -2020
Manuscript Title: Sentiment Analysis Models for Mapping Public Engagement on Twitter Data	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0459/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Dear Author, the title is clear of your content. You are mentioning about data analysis.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The abstract is clear. This paper focused in proper structural and unstructured data with the paper and is to the point. The author introduces the study of the classification model and data analysis background is clear.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Not proper alignment	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
-Missing Existing Status, Stylistic problems.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Please keep the font size and Alignment properly and include the data analysis,figures or tables in main body.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The research study methods are presented clearly and the conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Need to be Modify proper order..	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Minor revisions needed. Try to include Existing Status and include in real time sampling report.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Andrea Corradini	Email:
University/Country: Copenhagen School of Design and Technology	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Sentiment Analysis Models for Mapping Public Engagement on Twitter Data	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 59.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract does present the objects and goals of the paper. It also presents the results but little about the methods. The abstract needs some rewriting for there are some repetitions and language related problems.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	1

mistakes in this article.	
<i>The paper needs to be proofread.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The titles of the sections do not match their content. The study methods cannot be clearly pinpointed with the current structure of the paper.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The body of the paper is fairly clear, despite the flawed English.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The summary is fine. The conclusions fall too short and need to be expanded. There is the additional problem that the section "Conclusion" is actually not a conclusion section. Currently the section "Conclusion" should be named something like "Results" or similar.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The reference section is fine however more recent studies should be included. Several references are a bit old. A lot of research has been carried out in the area of sentiment analysis in the last years. This could be reflected in the references section.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	x
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The submission is interesting especially because it deals with a language, Bahasa Indonesia, that has not attracted much interest in the research community despite being spoken by over a hundred of millions of persons.

The paper is easy to follow, but it needs a major language improvement. The structure of the paper also needs to be updated for the current structure does not really reflect the content. Other said, the titles of the sections seem to be wrong. While the paper can still be read and understood the level of the English does not warrant publication as it is right now. I strongly suggest the authors to have the paper proofread, ideally by a native English speaker and then resubmit.

The section with title "Method" reports on the data preprocessing. The title is not correct and should be changed correspondingly. In this very same section regarding, either a graphical representation of the process or an explanatory example with a few sentences going though the phases described could have been very helpful. The authors write that they eliminate words whose length is less than 3 characters. They

may want to explain why. Is not there really any 2 or 3 word in Bahasa Indonesia that can be relevant for sentiment analysis? In English, removing all words of 2 or 3 letters would result in removing words like ape, sad, mad, bad, ok, among others, that in fact could provide some useful information for sentiment analysis. The authors further state that their second preprocessing stage is word normalization, to replace typos, misspelled words and slang language. The authors could provide more information about this process since it requires to first detect misspelled words, typos and slang. For instance, how is slang detected?

The section titles “Result and Discussion” does not really report on the results. It rather reports on the process of getting data and also about further preprocessing. There are some paragraphs in that section that are too technical such as when the authors refers to things like “.. *function delete_data_baca (tweet) ..*” That high level of details to refer to a certain specific method call that probably is part of the Twitter API is not necessary to understand the paper.

The section “Conclusion” should actually be renamed into “Results and Discussion” because it presents the results of the analysis of the data that was collected and classified. More graphical representation of the results is needed. Also, an explanation of the data in the Figure is a must.